



---

# ***Daily Report***

# **Soviet Union**

**FBIS-SOV-88-084**

**Monday**

**2 May 1988**

# Daily Report

## Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-084

### CONTENTS

2 May 1988

#### ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

|                                                                     |   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Geneva Disarmament Talks End Spring Session .....                   | 1 |
| U.S. 'Slowing Down' CW Talks .....                                  | 1 |
| 'Major' Soviet Contribution .....                                   | 1 |
| Nazarkin Interviewed .....                                          | 1 |
| Talks Resume 7 Jul .....                                            | 1 |
| Karpov Views INF Treaty, START, SDI [ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 18] ..... | 2 |
| Carlucci Claim of Changed SDI Stance Disputed .....                 | 4 |
| 'Jokes' Intended To Lull Public [Kulik] .....                       | 4 |
| Deep Cuts 'Impossible' With SDI [PRAVDA 2 May] .....                | 4 |

#### WORLDWIDE ISSUES

|                                                                                             |   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Larionova Profiles Private 'Survival' Foundation [PRAVDA 28 Apr] .....                      | 5 |
| Pact-NATO Talks Held on European Arms Cuts .....                                            | 5 |
| Former NATO, Pact Officers Urge Peace .....                                                 | 5 |
| OPEC Fails To Reach Production Cut Decision .....                                           | 6 |
| International Trade Union Conference Opens .....                                            | 6 |
| AUCCTU's Makeyev Speaks .....                                                               | 6 |
| Reception for Delegations .....                                                             | 6 |
| Yanayev Addresses Seminar .....                                                             | 6 |
| Afghanistan Proposes Soviet ADB Membership [Tokyo KYODO] .....                              | 7 |
| No 'Serious Obstacles' in Bid [Tokyo KYODO] .....                                           | 7 |
| Paper Cited on Current Regional Conflicts .....                                             | 8 |
| 'International Situation—Questions and Answers' [Pravdin, Kornilov, Pasko, Surguchev] ..... | 9 |

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

##### United States & Canada

|                                                                |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Joint Seismographic Equipment Tests Under Way .....            | 14 |
| Tests Aid Verification .....                                   | 14 |
| Further on Tests .....                                         | 14 |
| Representatives Vote To Limit Nuclear Test .....               | 15 |
| New 'Soviet Military Power' Edition Criticized .....           | 15 |
| Publication Distorts Doctrine [Chernyshev] .....               | 16 |
| 'Offhand Attacks' Prevent Good Summit Atmosphere [Zorin] ..... | 17 |
| Adamishin, Crocker Hold 'Constructive' Talks .....             | 17 |
| Adamishin Rejects NATO Claims .....                            | 18 |
| Zholkver on Media Propaganda at NATO Meeting .....             | 18 |
| Gulf Naval Force Given 'Greater Scope' .....                   | 19 |
| Weekly EKHO PLANETY Interviews Shultz .....                    | 19 |

##### China

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Border Talks in Beijing End 30 April .....                        | 20 |
| Journalists From Trade Union Paper Visit USSR [TRUD 29 Apr] ..... | 20 |
| Memorandum on Cooperatives Signed 28 Apr .....                    | 20 |
| Zhao Comments on China's Ethnic Problems [PRAVDA 26 Apr] .....    | 20 |
| Private Enterprise Expanding in PRC [Kulikov] .....               | 20 |

**Northeast Asia**

|                                                                |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Shevardnadze, Kim Yong-nam Meet, Address Lunch [PRAVDA 30 Apr] | 21 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----|

**Southeast Asia & Pacific**

|                                                                            |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Thai Prime Minister To Visit 16-22 May                                     | 24 |
| Gerasimov Views Cambodian Issue, Thai Relations [Bangkok THE NATION 1 May] | 24 |
| Afghanistan Accord Significant for Cambodia [Belov]                        | 25 |
| New Ambassador to Cambodia Appointed [PRAVDA 28 Apr]                       | 26 |
| U.S. Threatens Philippines Over Bases                                      | 26 |
| Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Philippines                               | 26 |
| Gilashvili Arrival Statement [IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]                            | 26 |
| Visit Ends                                                                 | 26 |
| Further Reportage on Razumovskiy Talks in Hanoi                            | 27 |
| PRAVDA Reports Talks [26 Apr]                                              | 27 |
| Demichev Meets Returning Plane                                             | 27 |

**Near East & South Asia**

|                                                                                    |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| UN Observers Arrive in Afghanistan 1 May                                           | 27 |
| Wakil Promises Assistance                                                          | 27 |
| Afghan Leaders' Reply Message on Revolution Day [PRAVDA 29 Apr]                    | 28 |
| Najibullah Rejects Possibility of Rebel Takeover [PRAVDA 30 Apr]                   | 28 |
| U.S. Arms Supplies to Afghan Rebels Condemned [Shurygin in PRAVDA 29 Apr]          | 28 |
| VOA Report on Afghan Weapon Movements Denied                                       | 29 |
| Afghan Rebel Leader Hikmatyar Denounced                                            | 29 |
| PRAVDA Reports Latest Kabul Bomb Incident [Okulov, 29 Apr]                         | 30 |
| Editorial Hails Achievement of Afghan Accords [PRAVDA 30 Apr]                      | 30 |
| Geneva Accord Key To Improved Pakistani Ties [(Viniazov)]                          | 31 |
| Soviet-Pakistani Anniversary Messages Exchanged                                    | 32 |
| U.S. Intends To Continue Supplies to Pakistan                                      | 33 |
| Gandhi Receives Kamentsev in Delhi 29 Apr                                          | 33 |
| Gromyko Receives Syrian, Libyan Envoys 29 Apr [PRAVDA 30 Apr]                      | 33 |
| Hails Libyan Role [Tripoli JANA]                                                   | 35 |
| Ivanov-Galitsyn Discusses Arab, Gulf Relations [Kuwait AL-SIYASAH 26 Apr]          | 35 |
| Journalists Meet With PLO Leaders in Tunis                                         | 39 |
| Libya Denounces NATO Mediterranean Exercises                                       | 39 |
| U.S. 'Intervention' in Gulf Condemned                                              | 39 |
| Iranian Tudeh Party Publishes May Day Appeals                                      | 40 |
| Agreement To Help Modernize Egyptian Plant [SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 28 Apr] | 40 |
| Briefs                                                                             | 40 |
| Health Agreement With Afghanistan                                                  | 40 |

**East Europe**

|                                                                  |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| PPR Strikes Designed To Raise May Day Tension [IZVESTIYA 29 Apr] | 40 |
| West Finds 'Pretext' in Strikes                                  | 41 |
| Jakes' May Day Speech Stresses Cooperation                       | 41 |
| Vorotnikov Montenegro Trip Stresses Direct Ties [PRAVDA 28 Apr]  | 42 |
| Berlin River Border Patrol Described [IZVESTIYA 27 Apr]          | 42 |
| MSZMP Holds Conference on Politics, Glasnost [PRAVDA 27 Apr]     | 43 |

**West Europe**

|                                                           |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Soviet Businessman Expelled as Industrial Spy [Stockholm] | 43 |
| Soviet, British Customs Officers Seize Drugs [Ponomarev]  | 44 |
| Britain's Howe Receives Adamishin in London               | 44 |
| Gromyko Receives Swiss Interior Minister [PRAVDA 29 Apr]  | 45 |
| More on USSR-FRG Forum on European Security               | 45 |
| Tolkunov, Zagladin Speak [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Apr]      | 45 |
| Dobrynin Meets With Group                                 | 46 |

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| FRG's Genscher Criticizes NATO Nuclear Policy .....               | 45 |
| FRG's Von Buelow Interviewed on Disarmament .....                 | 47 |
| FRG Bundesrat Approves INF Monitoring Accord .....                | 47 |
| Multisector Enterprise Formed With FRG Firm [PRAVDA 27 Apr] ..... | 47 |
| Vorontsov Talks in Ankara Described .....                         | 47 |
| Karpov Meets With Spanish Officials in Madrid .....               | 48 |
| Interviewed on Visit [Madrid] .....                               | 49 |
| Briefs .....                                                      | 49 |
| Soviet Television in Holland .....                                | 49 |

#### Latin America & Caribbean

|                                                                 |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Gorbachev Talks With Uruguayan Delegation [PRAVDA 30 Apr] ..... | 49 |
| Panama's Palma Decries U.S. 'Misinformation' .....              | 50 |
| Panamanian Minister Condemns U.S. Pressure .....                | 50 |
| Anti-U.S. Demonstrations Held in Panama .....                   | 51 |
| Former U.S. Army Officer on CIA Contra Aid .....                | 51 |
| Sandinist-Contra Cease-Fire Negotiations End .....              | 51 |
| Contra Stand Condemned .....                                    | 52 |
| Document on Sanctions Against Nicaragua Noted .....             | 52 |
| Gorbachev Letter Read at Mexican Meeting .....                  | 52 |
| Cuba's Castro Opens Eye Unit, Thanks Professor .....            | 52 |
| Mokanu-Led Delegation Ends Visit to Jamaica .....               | 53 |

#### NATIONAL AFFAIRS

##### Political & Social

|                                                                                                           |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Gorbachev Meets With Patriarch Pimen [PRAVDA 30 Apr] .....                                                | 54 |
| Metropolitan Pitirim Comments on Church Status [Rome LA REPUBBLICA 27 Apr] .....                          | 56 |
| Reportage on Moscow May Day Ceremonies .....                                                              | 56 |
| TASS Reports Parade .....                                                                                 | 57 |
| Shcherbitskiy Attends Events [IZVESTIYA 2 May] .....                                                      | 58 |
| Peace Policy Incompatible With Military Parades<br>[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 22 Apr] .....          | 58 |
| Zaykov, Nikonov Pay Visit to Moscow Shop .....                                                            | 58 |
| Zaykov Takes Part in Moscow Soviet Session .....                                                          | 58 |
| Biryukova Attends Meeting on Social Security .....                                                        | 58 |
| Kapitonov Attends Moldavian Party Plenum [PRAVDA 28 Apr] .....                                            | 59 |
| Central Committee Decision on Combating Crime .....                                                       | 59 |
| Yeltsin Comments on Dismissal, Interview [AFP] .....                                                      | 59 |
| Chernobyl Documentary Premieres 29 Apr .....                                                              | 60 |
| Tatars Threaten More Mass Demonstrations [AFP] .....                                                      | 60 |
| Subbotnik Accomplishments Detailed, Praised .....                                                         | 60 |
| Corruption Case Valuables Displayed in Moscow<br>[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 29 Apr] .....            | 61 |
| Uzbek Corruption Investigation Meets 'Resistance' [PRAVDA 29 Apr] .....                                   | 62 |
| Dictatorship of Stalinist Elites Denounced [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 26 Apr] .....                              | 63 |
| Journalist Union Leaders Debate Current Tasks [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 26 Apr] .....                           | 68 |
| 'Excessive Regulation' of CPSU Practice Noted [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 26 Apr] .....                           | 70 |
| 'Top Priority' Discusses Party Conference [Kuznetsov, Bogdanov, Plekhanov] .....                          | 71 |
| 'Russian Culture' Conference Aims Questioned<br>[Kochetkov, Yevseyeva in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 28 Apr] ..... | 74 |

##### Economic

|                                                                                         |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Council of Ministers Views 1st Quarter Results [PRAVDA 26 Apr] .....                    | 76 |
| RSFSR Releases 1st Quarter Statistics .....                                             | 79 |
| Aganbegyan Answers Callers' Questions on Reforms<br>[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Apr] ..... | 79 |



**Agricultural**

|                                                                             |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Nikonov Visits Kaluga Agro-Industrial Plant [PRAVDA 27 Apr] .....           | 84 |
| Warmer Weather Promotes USSR Crop Development [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 24 Apr] ..... | 84 |
| Media Report 23-30 Apr Agricultural Developments .....                      | 85 |

**Scientific**

|                                                      |    |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Soviet-Afghan Space Crew Holds News Conference ..... | 86 |
| Mission To Begin in Aug .....                        | 86 |
| Activities of 'Mir' Cosmonauts' Reported .....       | 87 |
| Instruments for Mars Exploration Described .....     | 87 |
| International Conference on Space Held .....         | 87 |
| Cosmonaut Attends 'Space Exploration Week' .....     | 87 |

**Military**

|                                                                             |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Yazov Briefs Diplomatic Missions on Doctrine [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Apr] ..... | 88 |
| KGB's Major General Shadrin Dies 'Suddenly' [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Apr] .....  | 90 |

## Geneva Disarmament Talks End Spring Session

### U.S. 'Slowing Down' CW Talks

LD292130 Moscow World Service in English  
2100 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] The head of the Soviet delegation at the disarmament conference in Geneva, Yuriy Nazarkin, has said the United States position is the main reason for the slowing down of the talks on drafting a convention to ban and eliminate chemical weapons. In an interview with a Radio Moscow correspondent at the end of the spring session of the conference, he said Washington was trying to win time to stockpile binary chemical weapons which it started to manufacture last (?December).

### 'Major' Soviet Contribution

LD300511 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Geneva April 29 TASS—The spring session of the Conference on Disarmament, attended by delegations from 40 countries, has ended at the Geneva Palace of Nations. The session focused on drafting a convention on complete and general ban and elimination of chemical weapons. The Soviet delegation made a major contribution to its work, by putting before the conference a memorandum on multisided exchange of data on the general stocks of chemical weapons, as well as on the facts of their manufacture, transfer or acquisition. Supplementing its proposals with concrete steps, the Soviet Union provided such facts. Some 25 countries, supporting the Soviet initiative, said they did not have such weapons.

The attainment of weighty practical results in the course of work on the draft convention was hampered by an inconstructive stance of the USA and a number of its NATO allies. Dodging a positive answer to the Soviet proposal under different pretexts, the USA continues manufacturing binary weapons.

The Conference on Disarmament will resume on July 7. News analysts believe that the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow and the 3rd special session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament in New York will give the necessary impetus to more fruitful work at Geneva.

### Nazarkin Interviewed

LD301103 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian  
0930 GMT 30 Apr 88

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Georgiy Alekseyev]

[Excerpts] The spring session of the Geneva disarmament conference has ended. Vladimir Dmitriyev, our correspondent, reports: [Passage omitted] I have talked with Ambassador Nazarkin, leader of the Soviet delegation to the conference, about the outcome of the present session:

[Begin Nazarkin recording] Working out the draft of the convention on completely banning chemical weapons continued. However, on the whole I have to say that the flow of these talks has noticeably slowed down. Admitting this, some Western representatives are attempting to explain the causes by the fact that new technical questions requiring additional study have developed in the course of the talks. They also say that the reality of concluding a convention has evoked an interest in the talks on the part of those states, which, even though they were previously participating in them, were generally behaving at the talks in a rather passive way. And now they have started bringing forward their proposals and ideas and to voice their concern. This more active participation also creates difficulties for the talks.

However, I resolutely disagree with the view that these circumstances represent the causes for the slowing down of the talks. The (?involvement) of the activity of a wider circle of countries is a natural process. Here it is necessary to take into account such an important circumstance as the talks having reached their limit, and the point when it is necessary for each participant to make important political decisions. The United States, first and foremost, has so far not made such a political decision. The United States is clearly striving to gain time in order to manage to set up a kind of binary weapons stock, which it would keep over a certain time while the process of destruction of chemical weapons according to the convention is under way.

In order to form an opinion about the prospects, it is in the first place, of course, necessary to bear in mind that soon, on 29 May, the summit meeting will commence in Moscow. And of course, there are grounds to expect that this meeting will give a strong impetus to the talks, including those in the sphere of banning chemical weapons. [end recording]

### Talks Resume 7 Jul

LD302149 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1743 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Geneva, 30 Apr (TASS)—The spring session of the disarmament conference, in which delegations from 40 states are taking part, has ended at the Geneva Palais des Nations. The greatest attention was paid at the session to the preparation for a convention on a complete and universal banning and scrapping of chemical weapons. A great contribution to this work was made by the Soviet delegation, which submitted for examination by the conference a memorandum on the multilateral exchange of data on overall reserves of chemical weapons, as well as facts about its production, transfer, or acquisition. Backing up its proposals with concrete steps, the Soviet Union presented such data.

The unconstructive stance of the United States and a number of its NATO allies has stood in the way of achieving more substantial results during the work on the draft convention. Using various pretexts, the United States is avoiding giving a positive answer to the Soviet proposals.

The disarmament conference will resume on 7 July. As has been noted here, the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow and the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament in New York can give the necessary push toward more fruitful work in Geneva.

**Karpov Views INF Treaty, START, SDI**  
*PM011403 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No. 18, 30 Apr-6 May (Signed to Press 28 Apr 88) pp 1, 2*

[Interview with V.P. Karpov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems Administration, by correspondent V. Voytenko: "May 1988: Hopes for Peace and Renewal"; date and place of interview not given—first paragraph is ARGUMENTY I FAKTY introduction]

[Text] On the eve of the Moscow summit meeting, the editorial office has received several hundred letters concerning Soviet-U.S. accords on arms limitation and the prospects for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Our correspondent V. Voytenko met with V.P. Karpov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems Administration, and asked him to answer the most frequently recurring questions from ARGUMENTY I FAKTY readers.

Correspondent: Viktor Pavlovich, how feasible is it for the work on the documents for a 50-percent reduction of strategic arms to be completed in time for the U.S. President's visit to the USSR?

Karpov: The work is being done. We receive news and reports from the delegations. Specific formulations are being elaborated for inclusion in the text of the treaty and its accompanying documents.

Is it realistic to expect that everything might be finalized in the time remaining before the end of May? For the time being, it is realistic. Let me emphasize: For the time being. If we were to come up against any delays by the U.S. Administration (and such a tendency does exist), we might run out of time. There are several major questions on which the sides have not yet reached mutual understanding.

For example, the sides have confirmed that they will adhere to accords on the observance of and nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty. We are talking about legally formulating this in the form of an agreement and appending it as a protocol, which would contain several additional verification measures making it easier for the sides to implement this accord on the observance of the ABM Treaty. This is what it is all about.

We are offering the U.S. delegation a simple way: Take the text of the 10 December 1987 accord on this question, and add a legal formulation, in other words, provisions on when it comes into force and for how long. Until

now, whenever this option has been discussed, we have come up against a stance based on the view which the U.S. delegation put forward before December last year. As in the past, they are trying to replace the December accord with a formula which would make it possible to lay down that, instead of observing the treaty, an accord will be reached to replace it with a new treaty which would permit a switch to a different system based on the deployment of strategic defense systems.

Correspondent: How can the emergence of such obstacles be explained?

Karpov: There are many factors, including certain differences of opinion in Washington, both inside the administration and around it. It is difficult to draw unambiguous conclusions, but there is evidently a certain caution among right-wing circles toward the actions of the U.S. President and the secretary of state. Uncertainties as to how the election campaign will develop and what questions will come to the fore also play a part.

Correspondent: Viktor Pavlovich, we often hear about instances of nonobservance of various accords by the U.S. side, and this automatically poses the question: Will the Americans not breach the provisions of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles?

Karpov: Now is the first time that, under the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, a rigid verification system is being established, a system missing from previous Soviet-U.S. accords on arms control. Take the 1972 ABM Treaty for example—it made no provision at all for an inspection system. Each side monitored the other by using national technical means.

Correspondent: Was this an oversight?

Karpov: No, at the time both we and the Americans were relying on monitoring by satellites, radar stations, and so on. But now, verification of the fulfillment of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will be carried out by a combination of these national technical means and a ramified inspections system, inspections both on a permanent basis and organized on the basis of very short notice—24 or 48 hours.

Following an announcement through the Nuclear Risk Reduction Center that an inspection group is on its way to the country, it will notify immediately on its arrival which specific facility is due to be inspected. Any operations connected with changing the situation at this facility must cease within 1 hour so that the inspection group can see the entire actual picture. The inspection group has the right to inspect this facility for 24 hours with a view to clarifying any circumstances which arouse its suspicions or, as the treaty itself provides, to verify the accuracy of information notified in the memorandum on initial data.

Thirty days after the treaty comes into force, both we and the Americans will have 60 days during which each will be entitled to inspect all the other's facilities declared in the memorandum on initial data. Facilities on the territory of the United States, Britain, Belgium, the FRG, the Netherlands, and Italy are subject to inspection. The Americans will inspect facilities located in the USSR, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia.

There will be permanent monitoring of the nonproduction of arms subject to elimination at the exit points of two plants: At Votkinsk (Udmurt ASSR) in our country, and at Magna, Utah, in the United States. Practical monitoring functions will already be in progress within 30 days after the treaty comes into force.

Preparations for this are progressing very actively; Americans have visited Votkinsk and they were offered specific options for the stationing of inspectors and the setting up of a monitoring station at the plant's exit point.

An inspection corps is being set up and trained, comprising approximately 400 men, who will carry out inspections from our side in the United States and West European countries. Such work has never been done before, and it provides security that, from the very beginning, both sides will have full guarantees that the other side will be unable to take any actions running contrary to the treaty's provisions.

Correspondent: Viktor Pavlovich, on the basis of your personal observations, is it more difficult to work with the Americans now than it was in the past?

Karpov: You know, the Americans are a practical people, I would say scrupulous. Once something starts getting done, it is done very thoroughly, in detail. This is why the work with Americans on agreeing the treaty's formulations and provisions demands much energy and time, attention, and concentration. Generally speaking, the work is difficult, but I think that this is the path that must be followed.

Correspondent: We say that we are agreeable to such a radical reduction of nuclear forces provided the United States does not withdraw from the ABM Treaty within 10 years and does not test weapons in space. But after this period, the United States will still be able to start deploying SDI, while we will have to replace what we have destroyed.

Karpov: There are, of course, no guarantees that the United States will not start deploying SDI in 10 years' time. But this is what I see as the positive aspect of a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms.

There will be no weapons in space for 10 years. The Soviet Union and the United States will reduce their strategic arms by one-half. A new, a qualitatively new

situation will develop and, by virtue of its objective and inherent characteristics, it will dictate the need to find approaches toward ensuring mutual security.

Many Americans are already asking: Is SDI necessary with the present level of arms, is there any sense at all in deploying this program when the prospect for the reduction and future elimination of nuclear weapons is already and actually taking shape?

There are many factors against SDI. Primarily technical. On sober reflection, the promising wishful thinking which the U.S. President voiced on 23 March 1983 has not materialized. It is impossible to create a 100-percent defense against ballistic missiles. It would be necessary to put up in space thousands of platforms with the appropriate missiles, lasers, and other strike systems. Currently the Americans do not have the means to put such quantities of freight into space, and nothing like it is being planned until the mid-nineties. This is the first factor.

The second factor: A system operating in space must be more than usually reliable. In view of the complexity of electronic systems, such reliability cannot be objectively provided. Any breakdown of any key elements would mean loss of operational efficiency by all subsequent layers. A malfunction in the system of high-speed computers performing billions of operations per second, a malfunction in any one link, could result in the system receiving totally different commands. It would either be paralyzed or start operating in a different regime.

In other words, there is a mass of technical questions which are as yet insoluble. This is the viewpoint held by some Americans even now: Is there any need at all to do all this? Would it not be better to ensure safety by mutual arms reduction, by securing guarantees of the nonuse of weapons against each other?

Correspondent: If this is the case, SDI might actually not be as dangerous as people in our country say?

Karpov: At times we are captives of our own propaganda. It sometimes happens that a thesis is elaborated with our propaganda workers using all sorts of arguments to support it, and as time passes it appears that we have attached too much importance to SDI. There comes a time when a realistic look can be taken at the future prospects of such work. The main point is: Provided observance of the ABM Treaty is secured for a sufficiently long period, it seems to me that the question of SDI could be not simply deferred but actually formulated in a different fashion, reflecting new conditions, and it could be solved in a way that the interests of universal security do not suffer.



### Carlucci Claim of Changed SDI Stance Disputed

#### 'Jokes' Intended To Lull Public

LD011736 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1049 GMT 1 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 1 May (TASS)—Political observer Sergey Kulik writes:

For some time now, U.S. propaganda has been making it out to be a joke which is purportedly without foundation; SDI does not mean "Strategic Defence Initiative," but just "slowly disappearing ideas". [Russian text provides English words within quotations in transliteration] Many things are cited in confirmation of this "joke": the fact that "Star Wars" is a fabulously expensive program, that there are many people opposed to it, and that technologically it is by no means beyond reproach. Rumors are even being circulated that the USSR "has changed its attitude to SDI" as well; it has become convinced of the "inoffensive nature" of it and therefore "SDI no longer plays an important part in concluding a treaty on a reduction in strategic offensive weapons."

It is these very assertions that are contained in an interview given by U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci to the West Germany magazine "DER SPIEGEL." He refuted the point of view that SDI is whipping up the arms race.

What kind of comment should one make about such assertions? The USSR has formulated its position precisely. It is willing to agree to a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons while observing the ABM Treaty and without departing from it during the period agreed upon.

Insofar as SDI is not contradictory to ABM, this program does not bear any relation to the Geneva talks. The principle on which such a stand is based is the renouncing of interference in the internal affairs of other states. Each country engages in such fundamental scientific research as its objective possibilities and requirements permit. As U.S. scientists themselves bear witness, however, the "Strategic Defence Initiative" has already imposed military and political aims on the research developed earlier in this sphere.

The supporters of 'Star Wars' are systematically endeavoring to give new boosts to this trend and to achieve the unconditional implementation of SDI. Attempts are being made to rehabilitate the program technically. This is the aim of the tests within the framework of the 'Star Wars' program which, in the opinion of its adherents, are supposed to convince the skeptics that the program is militarily effective and technically feasible.

Thus, in December 1987 the first ground tests of the laser code-named Zenith Star were carried out at a testing site in California, and in February 1988 another SDI experiment, Delta-181, was mounted in the course of which a laser radar was placed in orbit and tested. According to U.S. press reports, the SDI organization is at present actively examining the question of using combat missiles to hit a target in space, where in the next few years they want to deploy 11,000 missiles at 2,200 orbital combat stations or 'garages' ready to strike their targets. For 1988 alone, \$3.9 billion have been allocated for Star Wars.

So SDI is far from being 'a slowly vanishing idea.' Dangerous 'jokes' on this subject are being put about for but one purpose: to lull public opinion and, under cover of talk about the 'disappearance' of Star Wars, to make that program a reality.

Militarily, we are not afraid of SDI. As Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has said, the USSR will be able to develop an anti-SDI program that will be asymmetrical and less expensive than in the United States. Moreover, we can carry it out faster than the U.S. 'Star Wars' program, but we do not want to do that. SDI and anti-SDI would be an endless arms race that would be impossible to control.

#### Deep Cuts 'Impossible' With SDI

PM011551 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 May 88  
First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "SDI Again"]

[Text] Bonn, 1 May—U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci has given an interview to the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL in which, among other things, he touched on the question of the SDI program, which is the main obstacle to the achievement of radical Soviet-U.S. accords in the field of strategic arms reduction. The defense secretary claims, DPA reports, that SDI "no longer plays an important role with respect to the conclusion of a strategic offensive arms reduction treaty" and expressed the view that the Soviet side has changed its attitude to SDI. In the interview, the Pentagon head rejected the view that SDI fuels the nuclear arms race. "Precisely the reverse," he stated. "If anything brought the USSR back to the negotiating table, it was SDI."

The advancement of such theses by official representatives of the U.S. Administration gives rise to perplexity, to say the least. It is well known that the deployment or even the threat of deployment of SDI would lead to a sharp disruption of the stability of the international situation and would make deep cuts in strategic arms impossible.



**Larionova Profiles Private 'Survival' Foundation**  
*PM291333 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 5*

[N. Larionova article under the "Reader-Newspaper" rubric: "Contribution to the Great Cause"]

[Text] The creation of the "International Foundation for the Survival and Development of Mankind" has provoked considerable interest among PRAVDA readers. We are reproached with writing too little about this event. To make good this deficiency, we reply, in particular, to questions raised in a letter from V. Berdinskiy of Chelyabinsk.

Many new public organizations have appeared recently but this one—the "International Foundation for the Survival and Development of Mankind"—is special. Its creation illustrates yet again the positive changes taking place in the world. The foundation—the idea for creating it was first broached 1 year ago at the international forum "For a Non-Nuclear World and for Mankind's Survival"—will offer aid, notably material aid, in carrying out various research projects in the sphere of disarmament, ecology, and culture problems and will help to strengthen mutual understanding and cooperation among the publics of various countries.

It is a nongovernmental international organization financed by private individuals. Three centers for the foundation's activity have been determined: Moscow, Stockholm, and Washington. Account No 700195 has been opened in the Soviet Union Bank of Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development operations administration, containing the contributions made by our country's citizens. The U.S. Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston has undertaken to be the foundation's treasurer in the United States, where private donations have already been made. The largest contribution—\$1 million—has been made by Armand Hammer, the well-known businessman.

How can ordinary citizens influence the disarmament process and speed up or, on the other hand, slow down adoption of various decisions through this foundation? Here is just one example. People in Geneva have spent decades discussing the question of the possibility of verifying nuclear tests using technical systems. More than 300 meetings at governmental level have not brought the desired result. Then over 2 months, Soviet and U.S. scientists carried out a series of joint experiments, after which no one doubted that seismic instruments can monitor the fulfillment of agreements banning nuclear tests to any level. This initiative helped secure an accord on further development of the seismic method. This example shows that scientists and the public can pave the way for governments to conclude important agreements.

The foundation is constantly seeking projects which would be vitally important for mankind. Its efforts are geared toward solving tasks no one else is tackling at present.

A council of directors was elected at the inaugural session of the "International Foundation for the Survival and Development of Mankind." It is made up of influential scientists, politicians, and cultural figures from the Soviet Union, the United States, Sweden, the FRG, Italy, Spain, Britain, Brazil, India, Bulgaria, the GDR, and other countries. People were selected on the principle of considerable personal contributions, long activity in the area of detente, and prestige in the international arena. Soviet Academician Ye. Velikhov was elected chairman of the foundation's council of directors and J. Wiesner, former special assistant on science and technology to Presidents D. Eisenhower, J. Kennedy, and L. Johnson, was elected his deputy. The Swede R. Bjornstedt became the organization's executive director.

Cooperation among representatives of science, culture, and the business world in implementing the foundation's programs will help to establish closer links between real policy and public opinion and draw politicians' and scientists' attention to the assessment of a broad range of major problems of the day.

**Pact-NATO Talks Held on European Arms Cuts**  
*LD021012 Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT*  
*2 May 88*

[Text] Vienna May 2 TASS—A scheduled meeting has been held here today within the framework of the consultations between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO member countries to draw up a mandate for talks on a cut in the armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. The question was discussed of the rules of procedure and organization of work of the forthcoming talks.

**Former NATO, Pact Officers Urge Peace**  
*LD301303 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT*  
*29 Apr 88*

[Text] Vienna April 29 TASS—The fifth meeting of former officers of Warsaw Treaty and NATO states, held in Vienna, has marked a new important stage in the activities of non-governmental organizations and Generals for Peace and Disarmament groups, set up in a number of European countries. This remark was made by participants in the meeting, who held a press conference today.

Taking part in it were retired generals and admirals from 12 European countries. The meeting was held under the keynote of introducing new thinking in international affairs, stepping up efforts aimed at building a nuclear-free world, and exploring new, effective methods of cooperation.

The participants noted that the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles was a qualitatively new factor in world politics which indicated that efforts aimed at curbing nuclear arms were quite feasible. The speakers also stressed that many nations were looking to the leaders of the Soviet Union and United States for further steps to build peace, including a 50 per cent cut in strategic offensive armaments, the elimination of chemical weapons, reduction in the armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe.

**OPEC Fails To Reach Production Cut Decision**  
*LD011518 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT  
1 May 88*

[Text] Vienna May 1 TASS—Three days of a consultative conference of the Organisation of Oil-Exporting Countries (OPEC) have failed to yield specific results. Representatives of 13 OPEC states did not succeed in getting an agreement on a uniform stance regarding the proposal by seven non-OPEC countries for a five-percent cut in oil exports in May-June this year on condition that the OPEC countries act likewise. This step should help stabilize prices on the world oil market.

It has been learned after the completion of the regular meeting this morning that eight member states support Algeria's proposal for trimming daily oil production quotas by 300,000 barrels over the period between May 1 and June 30. At the same time, representatives of Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait insist that this reduction does not exceed 200,000 barrels. It has been officially announced that in the quest for a compromise decision the participants in the conference will continue their work Sunday evening.

**International Trade Union Conference Opens**

**AUCCTU's Makeyev Speaks**  
*LD291006 Moscow TASS in English 0953 GMT  
29 Apr 88*

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—"Perestroika, new thinking and trade unions is the topic of an international conference opening in Moscow today. [quotation marks as received] It is attended by representatives of trade unions from over 100 countries and several international organizations.

Opening the conference, Valentin Makeyev, secretary of the USSR Central Committee of Trade Unions (AUCCTU), pointed to the tradition of such Moscow meetings during May Day holidays. He called this corroboration of the fact that "there is a growing objective need in the world organized labour movement for comprehending the ongoing deep changes in the present-day world and for mapping out new approaches to a solution of serious political, economic, social and other problems."

"Of course we cannot take seriously harangues of our class enemies in the West on the so-called crisis of trade unions," he went on to say. "At the same time present-day realities show that we do not always catch up with requirements of life in all spheres. In other words, perestroika in a broad sense of this word is urgent not only for the Soviet trade unions." Valentin Makeyev pointed to the importance of coordinating efforts and strengthening unity of trade union actions and workers' solidarity.

"We do not entertain a delusion that meetings similar to our conference can give a universal theoretical formula, let alone a detailed action programme, equally acceptable for all," pointed out the AUCCTU secretary. "The task is more realistic: To exchange opinions on the most pressing questions for trade unions and to share experience."

Apart from plenary reports at the two-day conference, there will be "round table" meetings on issues of the international organized labour movement. The work of sections will be devoted to questions of restructuring activities of Soviet trade unions.

**Reception for Delegations**  
*LD011333 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT  
1 May 88*

[Text] Moscow May 1 TASS—Today the USSR Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU) arranged a reception in honour of trade union and labour delegations which had arrived in Moscow to celebrate the day of international solidarity of working people. It was attended by representatives of the trade union and labour movement from 118 countries, the World Federation of Trade Unions and regional trade union organizations.

A speech of greetings to the guests was addressed by AUCCTU Chairman Stepan Shalayev.

The reception was held in an atmosphere of cordial and fraternal international solidarity.

**Yanayev Addresses Seminar**  
*LD301522 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT  
30 Apr 88*

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS—The international trade union conference on the subject "Perestroika, New Thinking, and Trade Unions" has shown the topicality and necessity of frank and equal partnership of all currents in the world working-class and trade-union movement in solving specific problems which are of vital importance to everyone.

The conference which ended here today was attended by delegates of 109 countries and by representatives of international and regional trade union organizations. Apart from plenary sessions, panel meetings and round-table discussions were held within the framework of the conference.

Representatives of the trade union associations of France, Angola, Norway, Iraq, Algeria, and Finland pointed out in their speeches that the revolutionary restructuring process taking place in the Soviet Union and its social and economic aspects evinced a sustained interest of the working people of the whole world and their trade unions.

New approaches to a solution to problems of raising the wellbeing, cultural and spiritual level of Soviet people, and renunciation of stereotypes in foreign policy, the "more democracy, more socialism" principle which has become a basic one—all that, as was emphasized at the conference, is of immense importance not only to the Soviet Union but to the entire international community as well.

The establishment of the new political thinking in international practice contributes to eroding the "enemy image" and enables the peoples to get to know and understand one another better and to coordinate efforts to attain common goals.

The reality of the contemporary world is such that mankind has ceased to be immortal. Either the peoples would learn how to resolve common problems or would die together. This idea was voiced in speeches by the participants in the round-table meetings on issues concerning employment, foreign debt, the environment, and peaceful coexistence. At present it is no longer possible to regard the world development only from the viewpoint of struggle between the two opposite systems. Their interaction and cooperation acquire increasing importance. An immense role in this respect belongs to trade unions which bring together about 500 million people.

Speaking at the concluding plenary session, Gennadiy Yanayev, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions (AUCCTU), emphasized that the spectrum of problems of the present-day world was so wide that the trade unions would no longer be able to act effectively without analysing them and working out their own approach to them. This is why such meetings are of exceptional importance, for they make it possible to exchange views and to see similarity or divergence of evaluations, to find points of contact which are so essential for joint and parallel actions.

On the occasion of May 1, the day of internationalist solidarity of the working people, the AUCCTU secretary on behalf of the participants in the conference expressed solidarity with the peoples and workers struggling for national independence, social progress, against imperialism and neocolonialism.

**Afghanistan Proposes Soviet ADB Membership**  
*OW3004054588 Tokyo KYODO in English 0406 GMT 30 Apr 88*

[By Narito Ohta]

[Text] Manila, April 30 KYODO — Afghanistan proposed on Saturday that the Soviet Union take part in the Manila-based Asian Development Bank (ADB).

Afghan Finance Minister Muhammad Kabir, who spoke during the last session of the three-day 21st ADB annual board meeting, made the proposal before some 1,500 bankers and officials of 47 ADB member countries and observers from around the world.

The formal proposal for the Soviet Union's membership to the 21-year-old regional development bank is being viewed as success of aggressive behind-the-scenes lobbying by the Soviet Union during the current meeting, which began Thursday.

Andrey Achkasov, deputy general manager of the Soviet Union State Bank [title as received], told reporters on Thursday he was optimistic about Soviet participation in the ADB.

But, the senior official said, "the main issue of membership is to find the most effective and mutually beneficial way of contributing to the economic development of the Asia-Pacific region. Voting power comes later."

The Soviet Union first attended the ADB annual meeting held in Osaka, Japan, last year.

Oleg Mozhayskov, deputy managing director of the State Bank, met ADB President Masao Fujioka Thursday night to discuss the membership issue, but no details were disclosed.

**No 'Serious Obstacles' in Bid**  
*OW2904122188 Tokyo KYODO in English 0711 GMT 29 Apr 88*

[Text] Manila, April 29 KYODO—Moscow foresees no major "serious obstacles" in its standing bid to become a member of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) in the near future, a senior Soviet finance official said on Friday.

Andrey Achkasov, deputy general manager of the Soviet Union's Bank for Foreign Economic Affairs, told KYODO news service that the warming of diplomatic ties between Washington and Moscow during the past two years will ease American opposition to their membership bid.

"There would not be any serious obstacle (to the bid). I could say we could solve this matter of the Soviet Union entering the Asian Development Bank when the time comes," Achkasov said.



Achkasov and Oleg Mozhayskov, deputy managing director of the Soviet Union State Bank, were observers to the three-day annual meeting of the bank here which opened Thursday. They will meet bank President Masao Fujioka Friday night.

Achkasov acknowledged that political issues were involved in their entry bid to the bank dominated by Japan and the United States, which are quiet opponents of Moscow's move to join the bank. But he expressed confidence that these political issues will be resolved.

He did not give any specific timetable as to when Moscow will formally raise its membership bid to the bank's Board of Governors. There was initial speculation that a delegation from the South Pacific would support the Soviet Union's bid to join the bank.

Achkasov said the Soviet Union's decision to become a member and donor of the bank followed the Vladivostok speech of premier Mikhail Gorbachev in 1986.

He said the Soviet Union has "a quite good experience" in projects funded by the bank and could further help developing countries through increased economic and political assistance, citing Moscow-supported projects in India.

"If we finance 80 percent of a project, the remaining portion can be financed by the ADB," he said.

Achkasov said membership in the bank would give Moscow greater access to the world market and develop their export potentials. "Our main problem is we still have to considerably develop our external potentials."

Oil comprises a major portion of the Soviet Union's exports.

**Paper Cited on Current Regional Conflicts**  
*LD301549 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT*  
*30 Apr 88*

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS—The armed confrontation in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Nicaragua, which was ignited by the forces of imperialism and reaction, caused a heavy loss of human life and colossal material damage, put a break on the socio-economic development of those countries, the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes today in the article "National Reconciliation: Hopes and Worries". In these conditions the national reconciliation policy being enacted there now is an alternative to the military confrontation, which is dictated by life itself.

The idea of national reconciliation ripened in a different way. Afghanistan, for instance, had taken part in the negotiations with Pakistan on settling the erupted crisis, which were conducted with the assistance of U.S. secretary-general, back from June 1982. A fresh spur to this process was given in January 1987 when the Afghan

leadership put forward constructive and far-reaching proposals aimed at overcoming the prolonged conflict. The statements by the Soviet and Afghan leaders on February 8, 1988 and their meeting in Tashkent on April 7, 1988 gave a decisive impetus to solving the crisis, which made it possible for the process of a political settlement around the Republic of Afghanistan to enter a decisive stage.

In Kampuchea the key provisions of the national reconciliation policy were given tentative consideration in July 1987 by the foreign minister of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, who represented the Indochinese countries, and the foreign minister of Indonesia who represented the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) member countries. Eventually, these understandings were formulated in the statements of the Kampuchean Government in August and in October 1987.

As for the situation around Nicaragua, it is the constructive stance of the latter that helped reach an agreement on a political settlement of the situation in that region by the five Central American countries—Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and El Salvador in August 1987. Subsequently, it also facilitated the opening of direct negotiations between the government and the contras.

The national reconciliation policy yields its positive fruits already now, which inspires the hope for a possible cessation of bloodshed in various countries. Simultaneously the idea of national reconciliation gives new sprouts, the newspaper emphasizes. For instance, the leadership of Angola, in carrying through the national unity policy, launches a dialogue with the armed opposition except the bandits from the UNITA who are on the payroll of the racist Republic of South Africa.

A proposal was advanced in July 1987 for wrapping up an agreement between the Governments of Angola, Cuba, the Republic of South Africa and the South-West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) under the auspices of the U.N. Security Council or its five permanent members to grant independence to Namibia.

By and large, the present-day situation favours a peaceful settlement of crises. However, the warlike imperialist quarters go ahead with the quest for ways which would give them them an opportunity artificially to maintain tension, build up a stone wall to a political settlement of regional conflicts.

In this connection KRASNAYA ZVEZDA draws attention to the non-constructive stance of the United States which actually proclaimed the programme of continued military aid to the groups fighting against the lawful government in Afghanistan. It writes in detail about the difficulties on the way towards settling the situation



around Kampuchea and Nicaragua, the attempts by the South African racists to torpedo the efforts to tackle the problems of southern Africa.

The newspaper characterizes the watershed stage through which the countries, where the national reconciliation processes get under way, are going as the time of hopes and worries. The hopes for the earliest cessation of bloodshed, an opportunity to return to a peaceful life and creative endeavours. The worries for the destiny of the so far fragile accords, for the future of their countries as a whole.

**'International Situation—Questions and Answers'**  
*LD292330 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian*  
*1215 GMT 29 Apr 88*

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program, presented by All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Sergey Pravdin with TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov, commentator Vladimir Pasko, Lagos correspondent Vladimir Zhuravlev, and "my colleagues" Konstantin Patsyuk and Igor Surguchev]

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] Greetings, esteemed comrades. We shall start our program today, which as always has been compiled from your letters, by replying to questions on such urgent problems of the day as disarmament, eliminating the threat of war and ensuring peace, and the possibility of cooperation among all countries of our planet.

Of course, all these problems are major and independent ones, but the search for ways to solve them starts from one—from improving East-West relations or, to be even more precise, it starts from improving relations between the USSR and the United States, in search for ways to establish and strengthen trust between them. Of late, quite a lot has been done along this path. The three Soviet-U.S. summit meetings which have already taken place and which were made possible to a large extent thanks to the new political thinking proposed by our side, made it possible not only to start but also to develop dialogue. But many problems remain unresolved. It was precisely the discussion of all of these questions which the visit to our country on the eve of May Day by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz was devoted to. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze had talks with him. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met with the U.S. guest.

Now that Shultz' visit to Moscow has ended, one can say with complete justification that preparations for the new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting have entered the final straight, as the saying goes. In their broad discussions and commentaries on the forthcoming summit [preceding word in English] as the top-level meeting is called in the West, most observers agree on one point: The very fact that the forthcoming meeting is to be held is convincing evidence of the serious and positive changes in Soviet-U.S. relations.

Many of our listeners, including a group of doctors at the No 83 Children's Polyclinic in Pervomayskiy Rayon, Moscow—Vera Aleksandrovna Shalayevskikh, Frida Naumovna Uretskaya, Raisa Pavlovna Dubrovskaya, and that clinic's chief doctor, Olga Aleksandrovna Gorskogo—ask what the agenda will be for the forthcoming Moscow-Washington top-level dialogue which is to take place at the end of May and beginning of June. In our studio today is TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov. Please:

[Kornilov] This agenda will no doubt be very broad. It will embrace the most important international problems and questions of the state and development of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations. If one speaks about the main topics of the forthcoming dialogue, these are, of course, problems of international security and curbing the arms race. It is precisely these problems that, as is known, were pivotal in the summit talks at Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington. This is quite natural. Today the total power of world nuclear arsenals amounts to about 20,000 megatonnes—this is 1.5 million Hiroshimas. There is no problem more important than warding off the nuclear threat from mankind and breaking the all-destroying nuclear sword hanging over mankind.

The first and extremely important step in this direction has already been made. At the end of last year, the Soviet-U.S. treaty was signed in Washington on eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles; the process of ratifying this is drawing to a successful conclusion in these pre-May days. Now Moscow and Washington are preparing for the second step, an even bigger one—reducing by 50 percent the most dangerous and terrible weapons, strategic weapons. The arsenals of these are vast. The USSR has 2,494 strategic carriers and about 10,000 nuclear warheads for them. The United States has 2,260 carriers and about 16,000 warheads.

Is there any need to say how much easier the world would breathe if these death-dealing arsenals were halved?

[Pravdin] The extreme importance of such a step as a possible Soviet-U.S. treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons is understandable and does not need to be proved. However, if one looks through the latest utterances by many Western politicians and experts on political affairs, it is not difficult to see a common theme running through many of them as they ask whether it is reasonable to expect that the sides—Moscow and Washington—will be able, in the month remaining until the summit meeting, to overcome disagreements which still exist and be able to prepare such a complicated document as a treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons. This is asked, in particular, by Andrey and Galina Dodov from Moscow, Yevgeniya Yevgeniyevna Kireyevskaya from the town of Venev in Tula Oblast, and many other listeners.

[Kornilov] Why do our listeners quote Western political experts? This question is being asked here in Moscow, too. The reduction of strategic offensive weapons is indeed an extremely complicated matter which requires from both sides—I stress from both sides—firm political will, flexibility, and persistence, the readiness to compromise, in brief the most intense, in the full meaning of the word, work to seek out mutually acceptable solutions on many specific and very considerable questions.

These questions concern the implementation of the accord reached between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Washington in December on the observation of the ABM Treaty and not departing from it for an agreed period. There are serious, very serious problems, connected with sea-based long-range cruise missiles. Our country consistently displays initiative by putting forward concrete proposals on restricting these weapons and on verifying the proposed restrictions. However, the United States, in the main, only expresses doubts about the effectiveness of the restrictions proposed by the USSR and in essence does not propose anything in their place.

Also far from being finalized are the U.S. ideas on air-based cruise missiles. They, our experts are convinced, contain proposals which, if adopted, would only open up loopholes for evading the established restrictions.

So, the question of whether the sides will be able to complete the very difficult multifaceted work to prepare a treaty on strategic offensive weapons in the time left before the summit meeting really does arise. I would not undertake at this moment, today, to give an exhaustive and simple answer to this question. This is all the more so because it is well known that the more sophisticated the weaponry, the more difficult it is to verify an agreement to eliminate it.

But one thing is very clear: The problem of reducing strategic offensive weapons has firmly occupied first place in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue. The importance of this fact is truly difficult to overestimate. Of no less importance is the fact that during the Moscow-Washington dialogue, there is discussion, study, and increasingly serious analysis of other important problems of disarmament. What I am referring to here is the banning of chemical weapons, reductions in what are known as the conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, and the problem of nuclear tests. There is no doubt that solutions can be found for all these questions, provided, I repeat, that the appropriate political will exists and on the basis of equality and equal security, taking account of the interests of all other states and peoples.

[Pravdin] Of course, there are grounds for optimism, and it is no coincidence that the joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the results of the recent visit to Moscow by Secretary of State Shultz notes that this visit was businesslike and

constructive. But the visit did not take place in a vacuum. It was preceded by a whole series of speeches by the incumbent of the White House, in which he dwelt in detail on relations between the USSR and the United States. Among these was his recent speech in Springfield, Massachusetts.

Recognizing that a fundamental turnaround had taken place in Soviet-U.S. relations, Reagan at the same time zealously stood up for and justified the Washington policy of acting from a position of strength. He repeated again and again the well-worn fantasies about the aggressiveness and expansionism of the USSR, and even went so far as to say that the establishment of normal East-West relations is impossible without a change in the internal order in the Soviet Union. Naturally the question arises—and it is put to us, in particular, by Nikolay Nikolayevich Vesnyakov from Moscow—as to how one can explain the fact that speeches of this kind are to be heard from Washington, and even from the White House, indeed, at this particular time when preparations are being made for a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

[Kornilov] I have no doubt that the rhetoric of confrontation to which the U.S. President and others, indeed, have been resorting of late is not a fortuitous happening: It is not just some unexpected flare-up of anti-Soviet feeling that generally speaking is characteristic of some Washington leaders, and I do not think that it is simply a burden from the past. We must not forget that we are dealing with experienced, sharp, and I would say, dyed-in-the-wool, bourgeois politicians who usually have a definite aim insofar as they make their attacks on the USSR and on socialism. In this particular case, I think, there are several such objectives. Let us note, first of all, the period in which the speeches we are talking about are taking place. Soviet restructuring and the affirmation in our life of the principles of glasnost, humanism, and genuine and deep democratism have led to a situation in which anti-Soviet clichés and stereotypes which have taken years to erect in the West, including and primarily in the United States, are collapsing like houses of cards.

The international prestige and authority of our country and of socialist ideas has grown and continues to grow. It is also important to note the fact that the revolutionary advances in the USSR and current positive changes in Soviet-U.S. relations have coincided with the presidential election campaign in the United States itself, a campaign in the course of which U.S. ultraright-wing circles, expressing their own selfish interests and the egoistical aspirations of the mighty military-industrial complex and the arms kings and lacking any interest in reducing tension, criticize the administration from the right, accusing it virtually of surrendering its positions and retreating in the face of the Reds. Under these conditions, the President bows diligently to the right, so to speak, in pursuit of at least two objectives at one and the same time: on the one hand, that of trying to get around the right-wing extremists, those guardians of

conservative virtue—as one U.S. newspaper put it succinctly, those champions of confrontation and the arms race, whose weight and influence in the political life of the United States must never be played down; and on the other hand, that of trying to dislodge the growing interest in and affection for the Soviet Union on the part of the U.S. public and the Western public overall and to cast a shadow over our restructuring and socialism.

If one is to put things more bluntly, it has to be said that unwillingness to take political realities into account certainly cannot help bring about fruitful Soviet-U.S. dialogue. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed in his conversation with Shultz on 22 April, it is time to get rid of the delusion that the position of the present Soviet leadership is supposedly unstable, that it has an interest in achieving some kind of foreign policy success and that it is trying to persuade the Americans to take up cooperation for that very reason. Real policy cannot be built on garbage like that.

[Pravdin] Considerable space in the agenda for the Soviet-U.S. summit will be taken up by problems of regional conflicts, insofar as one can judge from press reports. Our listeners Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Tyutrin from Orekhovo-Zuyevo and Comrades Murzayev from Kuybyshev and Ivanovskaya from the village of Kholshcheviki in Moscow Oblast ask what are the real prospects for a settlement of such conflicts?

[Kornilov] A lot has been done recently for solving regional problems that disturb the world, just as it has for solving disarmament problems. Further progress, however, is being slowed down on account of the unconstructive and, I would say, two-faced stance of the United States and on account of the striking contradictions—I would put it bluntly—that continue to divide Washington's words from its real policy even today. The recent Soviet Government statement on Afghanistan stresses that in its significance, the signing of the Geneva agreements matches the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

However, one cannot but be put on one's guard by the stance of some politicians and statesmen, the statement goes on to note. The ink had hardly dried on the signatures placed on the Geneva documents when utterances began to be made that were in contradiction of the spirit and the letter of the Geneva agreements. Indeed, in Washington they would appear to agree that more favorable opportunities are opening up for removing other hotspots, too, now that the first breakthrough in the chain of regional conflicts has been made as a result of the signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan; however, in welcoming the Geneva agreement package, Washington at the same time states that it intends to continue to deliver military supplies to rebel groups which are fighting the lawful Government of Afghanistan.

In Washington they say a great deal about the need to eliminate and close off dangerous hotbeds of tension in other regions, yet at the same time, in the service record of the architects of U.S. foreign policy of neoglobalism, there are facts like the stubborn refusal to end the war against sovereign Nicaragua; the encouragement given to the racists of South Africa, who are continuing their sorties against Angola; the connivance at Israel's creeping annexation of age-old Arab lands; and the saberrattling in Panama and the Persian Gulf. How can the one be reconciled with the other? It is impossible to reconcile them.

[Pravdin] Myths grow like weeds. Unlike facts, they need no looking after. This was noted in his day by Marcy, one of the leaders of the U.S. Committee on East-West Accord. While giving this observation full marks for originality, I will, nevertheless, point out that by no means does it always reflect the true state of affairs. For example, the myth that regional conflicts are kindled not by the United States and not by imperialism but by someone else clearly does not spring up of its own accord in the West but is deliberately cultivated in precisely the same way as, say, the myth about the United States being virtually the yardstick where democracy and human rights are concerned. The progress of discussion of humanitarian problems at the Soviet-U.S. talks is the subject of enquiries from our listeners Veraa Dmitriyevna and Tatyana Dmitriyevna Rudneva from Moscow, from Comrades Badeykov from Gorkiy, Chuyko from Saransk, Lizzachev from Chkalovsk in Gorkiy Oblast, Aleksey Ivanovich Asmeykov from Penza, and others.

[Kornilov] Humanitarian problems which we have already discussed today are an important component in the Moscow-Washington dialogue. Unfortunately, however, our U.S. partners, up until the present time at least, have without any justification for doing so assumed most frequently of all in the discussion of these problems the role of mentor with the job of teaching each and everyone the basic principles of democracy. By what right and on what basis no one knows—as if the world had no knowledge of the 3 million American homeless, of the millions of U.S. citizens deprived of the right to work, of the fact, for example, that the incomes of black Americans are on average just a little more than 50 percent of the incomes of white Americans.

Now, in the run-up to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, our country, where the processes of democratization and glasnost, despite the opposition of those opposed to restructuring and all manner of people prepared to turn out to mourn the passing of socialism, are asserting themselves ever more firmly and irreversibly on every floor of our social edifice, our country now places this question in the following way: Isn't it now time for the Washington fighters for rights to give up their manner of talking as though it is for them to expose, accuse, and instruct others? What the Soviet and the international public expect from Washington and its representatives is



not the repetition of anti-socialist dogmas and inventions that have set the teeth on edge and have long been rejected and refuted by life. What is expected is a readiness to participate in a businesslike discussion and constructive cooperation: the kind of discussion and the kind of cooperation which would enable a contribution to be made to improving the lives of people everywhere, including—and importantly so—those in the United States.

In short, we see that no matter from what angle one approaches the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, it is quite obvious that its participants are faced with a lot of extremely important, serious, and complex problems. Is it going to be possible to solve all these problems and take the next radical step in renewing Soviet-U.S. relations upon principles of dialogue and constructive cooperation? Time will provide the answer. As far as our side, the Soviet side, is concerned, it is filled with resolve to do everything incumbent upon it to logically extend the course that has run through Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington—a course toward peace, trust, and cooperation.

[Pravdin] Viktor Sergeyevich Loginov, from the town of Konakovo in Kalinin Oblast, a regular listener of ours, asks why the United States is refusing to exchange data on armaments and what specifically is holding up progress towards a treaty on strategic offensive weapons. I have put your question to my colleague, commentator Vladimir Pasko:

[Pasko] The refusal of the United States to exchange data on armaments has attracted the attention of many listeners. I think there is just one reason for this refusal. Displaying the real correlation of forces is not to NATO's advantage from the propaganda point of view. As you know, the Atlanticists claim that the Warsaw Pact has a military superiority. This assertion lies at the foundation of all of NATO's military programs: It is at the foundation of the West's rejection of the socialist countries' initiatives aimed at lowering the level of military confrontation in Europe. Having removed the foundation, publication of the data would lead to destruction of the whole structure. The proposals of the Soviet Union, therefore, have failed to meet with Washington's understanding. As far as obstacles to the 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments are concerned, there are many problems here. There are many difficulties with sea-based long-range cruise missiles. If one takes as one's starting point what has been published on this subject, still unresolved is the question of how to rule out the possibility of circumvention of the accords being worked out and the levels that are going to be set out in the agreement. The United States is proposing that the problem be solved by substituting statements for obligations undertaken by the sides. But this, of course, is no solution to the issue. What is needed here are precise obligations and reliable verification.

The question of air-based cruise missiles remains unresolved. The United States is proposing, in particular, that heavy bombers should be divided into categories according to the type of weapons they carry and that those which are equipped with non-nuclear means should be taken out of the reckoning. But with modern technology, there is no difficulty in reequipping an aircraft and turning it into a vehicle for the delivery of nuclear weapons. The Soviet side, therefore, rejects this solution. We propose that every heavy bomber, however it is equipped, should be included in the number of strategic delivery vehicles.

There are other unsolved problems, too. The U.S. State Department counted 1,200 brackets in the draft treaty, that is to say, 1,200 questions which still have not been agreed. However, according to Karpov, the head of the Directorate for Problems of Arms Limitation and Disarmament of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, this is nothing to be frightened of. These brackets, he said, derive from unresolved problems. The questions that are linked with them will be resolved automatically as they are agreed. According to diplomats, there is, all the same, some movement at the talks. The basic contradictions, however, remain. If they are not solved, it is difficult to count on a treaty being ready by the end of May. It is, however, known that another meeting between the two countries' foreign ministers is due to take place, and it has to be expected that this will provide a final answer to the question of whether or not a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons is going to be prepared for the Moscow meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the United States. [passage omitted on Zhuravlev remarks]

[Pravdin] Vera Vladimirovna Belyakova from the city of Mozdok in North Ossetiya asks a number of questions about the price of oil: How much does it cost today on the world market? Why have oil prices fallen? How much does oil production cost us and so on. [passage omitted on factors leading to oil price reductions at times when oil production is getting more costly] By reducing output, the oil exporting countries—the 13 states which produce approximately two-thirds of oil output on the world market—have managed to lift prices to \$18 a barrel. That is the level they are currently holding now. And this is the price at which we ourselves sell oil. As far as the prime costs of our oil are concerned, those figures have not got into the press. It is generally known, however, that prime costs are rising, for we have already gone to Siberia and the North, even, in the search for oil. I would like to note, however, that no matter how great these prime costs, they do not affect world prices: We provide just 25 percent of the world oil market. We are not the ones who set the prices there.

Economists say that the fall in oil prices has led to a noticeable reduction in the Soviet Union's currency receipts. In 1985 and in the first half of 1986, there was a shortfall in receipts because of this amounting to \$6 billion. This fall raised acutely the question of the



structure of our exports. The 27th CPSU Congress required that the proportion of raw materials should be reduced and that these should be replaced by finished output, especially engineering output. Certain progress here has already been made. When receiving members of the U.S.-Soviet trade and economic council in the Kremlin on 13 April, Comrade Gorbachev noted that in a year there had been a 30 percent increase in exports of machines, equipment, instruments, and other engineering goods for freely convertible currency. This year, deliveries will rise by 2.5 times. [passage omitted on Patsyuk remarks]

[Pravdin] Vasily Pavlovich Chelgunov, from the town of Kemerovo, asks why there are two communist parties in India. Do they work together? My colleague Igor Surguchev replies:

[Surguchev] The Communist Party of India, the CPI, has existed in India since December 1925. It currently has more than 445,000 members and is a national party with influence and support on a country-wide scale. In November, 1964, a group of leading figures in the CPI broke away from it and formed a new Communist Party of India—Marxist. The word Marxist, in brackets, was used by the new party to distinguish itself from the CPI, having accused the latter of supporting revisionism. The creators of the CPI (Marxist) used the word revisionism to describe the debunking of Stalin's personality cult in our country and the process which followed this of reviewing the norms and forms of relations between communist parties which were introduced during the period of Stalinism. The deepening of the split in India's Communist movement was also encouraged by the

movement of the CPI (Marxist) toward positions of Maoism. And although these historical reasons for the split have lost their topicality, it still remains.

The Communist Party of India (Marxist) has not been able to become a national force, but it does have a firm base in several parts of the country, and primarily in the states of West Bengal, Kerala, and Tripura. In its ranks there are about 370,000 people. Today this party is not the same as it was 20 or even 5 years ago. It has long ago cast aside the Maoist dogmas. It warmly supports the bold foreign policy initiatives of the USSR in the field of disarmament and ensuring universal peace, and the Soviet leadership's new political thinking.

Normal relations between the CPI (Marxist) and the CPSU have effectively been established. Thus India's two communist parties essentially have no differences now in their views of the main world problems, the problems of the international communist movement and the role of the Soviet Union and the CPSU in the world today. However, some differences of an ideological and tactical character on issues concerning activity within the country do remain between the CPI and the CPI (Marxist). Although their desire to move closer together and coordinate their activity have been noticeable in recent times, it is clearly still somewhat early to talk of restoring the unity of India's Communists.

Nevertheless, in both parties, the opinion exists that this objective can be achieved by means of gradual elimination of differences and those obstacles which have built up over the period of almost a quarter of a century in which the two communist parties have existed.

## United States & Canada

### Joint Seismographic Equipment Tests Under Way *LD300844 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 30 Apr 88*

[Text] A group of Soviet and U.S. scientists is carrying out an important joint experiment at the testing ground in the U.S. state of Nevada. An underground explosion of conventional explosives with a capacity of 10 tonnes was carried out there several hours ago. Another such explosion is scheduled to occur soon. U.S. and Soviet seismographs have been installed at various distances from the epicenter, and will register the strength of the signals to determine the capacity of the explosion.

The main aim of these experiments is to prove that the U.S. and Soviet scientists now have at their disposal reliable equipment to monitor [kontrol] even the smallest underground tests. It is now practically impossible to hide them.

### Tests Aid Verification

*LD011504 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT  
1 May 88*

[Text] San Francisco May 1 TASS—TASS correspondent Yuriy Algunov reports:

The needles of sensitive instruments attentively listening to heaves of the earth's entrails, quivered. This meant that an important intermediate stage of the joint Soviet-American experiment on monitoring yields of underground tests ended successfully. Instruments accurately registered the echo of underground detonations.

The tense work of seismologists of the two countries near the nuclear proving ground in Nevada state lasted for two days. Such experiments were conducted in the USA for the first time. The experiment started on Friday with an explosion of a 10-ton TNT non-nuclear charge. On the same day a similar blast was set off. The third charge of 15 tons ripped the air in the Nevada desert near Broken Hills on Saturday. The charge was buried at a depth of 50 metres. The experiment was specially conducted at three various areas to monitor the travel of a shock wave and electromagnetic waves through rocks various in structure. Seismometers were also set up at various distances.

The experiment is conducted by the U.S. scientific organization Natural Resources Defense Council in close cooperation with representatives of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The programme of cooperation drafted on the basis of agreements between the two countries entered its practical stage last year when the first joint tests of seismic equipment were conducted in Kazakhstan in the area of Semipalatinsk.

It was possible to find out during the present stage of the experiment that hard rocks of Nevada where the proving ground for underground nuclear tests of the U.S. Department of Energy is situated, absorb waves caused by explosions to a greater extent than soil around the proving ground near Semipalatinsk. Earlier, this was the reason for specialists' differences in assessing yields of tested nuclear charges. Now it has been proven, as Holly Eissler, a research geophysicist at the University of California San Diego and a participant in the programme, pointed out, that even the smallest blasts can be reliably registered by scientific equipment. Any attempt at violating agreements on limiting nuclear tests is quite verifiable, she noted.

"The experiment is successful," Charles Archambeau, a University of Colorado-Boulder geophysics professor, said. "It means that we can more accurately gauge the numbers and distribution of stations that will be required to verify a low-threshold treaty." Investigations will contribute to progress at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear tests.

"The experiment will continue and will include researchers from other countries," Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, told TASS. "Its aim is to develop a reliable and efficient seismic method of verification of agreements on limiting and, eventually, banning completely nuclear tests."

### Further on Tests

*LD301237 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 0158 GMT 30 Apr 88*

[Text] San Francisco, 30 Apr (TASS)—TASS correspondent Andrey Sidoren reports:

A group of Soviet and U.S. scientists has set about an important joint experiment in the state of Nevada, where the U.S. Energy Department's underground nuclear test site is located. The first conventional explosion of a charge of trinitrotoluene with a capacity of 10 tonnes was carried out at a depth of about 50 meters in the area of the Black Rock desert.

It is planned to carry out soon a second such explosion in the area of (Letrop Wells) 80 km south of the Nevada test site. U.S. and Soviet seismographs have been installed at various distances from the epicenters and they are to register the strength of the signals and determine the power of the changes. A third explosion with a capacity of 15 tonnes is to be carried out on Saturday in the area of Broken Hill about 160 km north of Reno.

The main aim of these experiments which are being carried out for the first time on the territory of the United States is to prove that U.S. and Soviet scientists already have reliable seismic apparatus which can monitor even the smallest underground tests and that it is now virtually impossible to conceal them. "Normally,

the capacity of underground nuclear explosions is measured in hundreds or thousands of tonnes," Doctor Thomas Cochran scientific head of the project from the U.S. side, noted in this connection. In his words, the equipment used in the present experiment is sufficiently sensitive to determine the difference between nuclear explosions and those that are carried out for industrial purposes and also to register the smallest earthquakes.

Similar experiments were already successfully carried out by specialists of the two countries last year in Kazakhstan near Semipalatinsk. They are being carried out in accordance with the agreements signed in May, 1986 and June, 1987 by the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council and the USSR's Academy of Sciences.

This initiative by Soviet and U.S. experts can to a considerable extent facilitate progress at the intergovernmental talks which began in November last year between the USSR and the United States on the question of banning nuclear tests. As a first step, the participants in these talks must agree on effective monitoring measures which will make it possible finally to ratify the 1974 Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Limiting Underground Tests of Nuclear Weapons and the 1976 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. Further, it is planned to begin reaching agreement on interim restrictions on nuclear tests to reach the final aim of their total cessation. As was stressed in this connection by Soviet Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, who is present at the Nevada experiment: "We consider that a treaty on the total and universal banning of nuclear weapon tests would be extremely important in putting an end to the arms race."

**Representatives Vote To Limit Nuclear Test**  
*LD300950 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT*  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Washington April 29 TASS—The U.S. House of Representatives voted to ban all nuclear tests with a yield of over one kiloton provided the Soviet Union also abides by the same position. This decision was adopted by 214 votes against 186 as an amendment to a bill under discussion on military appropriations for the fiscal year 1989. In the previous years the House of Representatives twice voted in favour of a similar measure in the sphere of arms control.

At the same time congressmen rejected an amendment by 205 votes against 197, according to which the USA should impose a permanent ban on anti-satellite tests (ASAT). The U.S. press noted that the Washington administration did not expect such a result. Earlier, the House of Representatives approved, for three years running, amendments providing for a ban on anti-satellite system's tests. Proceeding from this fact, this time the Pentagon did not request at all any appropriations for the ASAT programme in the coming fiscal year starting October 1.

The voting on both amendments in the House of Representatives which examines the bill on military appropriations to the tune of some 300 billion dollars, was of a purely symbolic character, notes the newspaper "WASHINGTON POST". In the past two years the Senate refused to support attempts by the House of Representatives to achieve prohibition of nuclear tests, writes the newspaper.

**New 'Soviet Military Power' Edition Criticized**  
*LD291522 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT*  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Washington April 29 TASS—TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy reports:

The Pentagon today issued the annual publication "Soviet Military Power". This time it has a subtitle "An Assessment of the Threat". This is not the only difference of the seventh annual publication from the previous six.

And these differences, alas, are not that the Pentagon suddenly gave up the verbiage of the times of the cold war or groundless accusations of "aggressiveness", "militarism", "imperialism" and the striving for "world preponderance" levelled at the USSR. The seventh publication of the U.S. Department of Defence abounds in such expressions. This time they in the Pentagon have decided to "analyze" the effects of perestroika, openness and new thinking on the Soviet Union's foreign and military policy. The Pentagon theorists are of the opinion that they have no impact on this policy at all. The publication asserts that all this is just a change of style by means of which Moscow seeks to take attention away from Soviet militarism and adventurism in foreign policy.

Another difference of such six publications of the Pentagon is that this time it tries to apply "historic and philosophical" principles to its analysis. This is how such attempts at theorising look: "Russian civilization has not assumed such basic Western concepts as constitutionalism, democratic government, the right of the individual, or the free, entrepreneurial market."

Demagogical theorising is, as always, accompanied by a spate of colourful graphs, diagrams, maps, aimed at intimidating the reader with the United States "lag" on almost all parameters behind the USSR and NATO's lag behind the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. A map of "Military Operations in Eurasia", allegedly planned in the Soviet Union is aimed at a particularly intimidating effect. Red and black arrows representing military strikes stretch from the USSR territory in all directions. They reach Scandinavia, West Germany, France, Spain, Britain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan, India, China, Japan, and even Alaska, which has nothing to do with Eurasia. It is said in the



chapter which this map illustrates that though the Soviet Union would prefer to use only conventional armed forces, it is also prepared to use nuclear and chemical weapons.

"While we continue to hope for meaningful change on the Soviet's part to less aggressive and less dangerous policies and postures, to-date, we have seen no evidence of the USSR changing the offensive nature of its force structure and deployment patterns", U.S. Secretary of Defence Frank Carlucci writes in the preface to the publication.

The stirring up of the myth about the Soviet military menace is a traditional method of the U.S. politics, particularly at a time when the budget is being drafted. Budgetary considerations can easily be traced in this year's publication of the Pentagon. It is stated in it outright that "the trend toward reduced defence funding that began in 1985", against the background of "such substantial improvements" in Soviet military power "could have potentially disastrous consequences".

However improbable, it is a fact that the Pentagon's annual publication has not been influenced in any way by either the December meeting in Washington between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan, or by the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Issue [as received] (according to the publication, it only emphasizes the dangerous tendencies in the organisation of the Soviet military forces), or by the work on an agreement to reduce the strategic arsenals of the two countries, or the constant meetings of their foreign ministers, or by the fact that the Moscow summit is drawing nearer.

The seventh publication of the Pentagon means the same exercise in misinformation, rigging facts and outright lies in which they on the banks of the Potomac were engaged at a time when the President of the United States described the USSR in none other way than as "the empire of evil".

Such a publication can do nothing but harm to Soviet-American relations.

#### **Publication Distorts Doctrine**

LD292218 Moscow TASS in English 2133 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

The Pentagon brought out another annual publication purportedly to analyze the correlation of forces between the USSR and the USA, the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO. This is the seventh such issue, and this year's publication differs somewhat from the previous six. Proceeding from the view that new thinking is

gaining the ground everywhere in the world, also in the military area, and taking into consideration the fact that the Pentagon now has the new chief, one could expect realistic tendencies in the new publication of the U.S. Department of Defense. Have these expectations come true? Regrettably, one has to give a negative answer.

The very title of the annual issue "Soviet Military Power" now has a subtitle "An Assessment of the Threat." This is indicative of the tendency of the "survey". It is clear that it seeks to convince the reader at once of the existence of such a "threat." The title thus gives one an impression that it is only a matter of assessing the scope of the threat. As to the contents of the annual issue, it is impossible to sum up in a brief commentary all the absurdities, half-truths and distortions heaped up in it. Therefore we shall so far limit ourselves to one area: We shall trace how the Pentagon's writings distort Soviet military doctrine.

"Soviet military doctrine views war as an extension of politics and emphasizes offensive operations...", the authors write. They declare that the aim of Soviet military doctrine is victory in a whole spectrum of conflicts—from limited conventional conflicts to strategic nuclear war. Apparently in order to impart some semblance of truthfulness to these groundless assertions, the authors of the "research" say that in the eighties the USSR started including defensive operations in its strategy while the entire strategy, allegedly, still remains an offensive one. And the authors make reference to the recent book by the USSR Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov "on guard for socialism and peace." But it is apparent that they do not quote from it accurately.

They do not even mention the real provisions of Soviet military doctrine set out in the book: the doctrine's being aimed at preventing war—both nuclear and conventional, the relationship of the two tasks reflected in the defensive character of the doctrine—effort to prevent war and readiness to repulse an aggressor. It follows from the definition of Soviet doctrine that it is aimed at preventing war, not at preparation for war, at consolidating international security, not at unleashing wars. The doctrine, naturally, provides for effective political and defensive measures aimed at preventing aggressor from launching war and at dispelling his illusory hope of winning war.

Can the assertions of American strategists about the "offensive character" of the Soviet doctrine be regarded as objective ones, if Soviet official documents state outright that Soviet military doctrine views defence as the main kind of military operations in repulsing aggression? It is only after the attack is repulsed that troops and Navy are to launch a counteroffensive. The Pentagon researchers have also failed to notice the most patent confirmations of the defensive character of Soviet military doctrine: the Soviet Union's obligation not to start military operations against any country or alliance of countries under any circumstances unless the Soviet



Union or its allies are attacked, the Soviet Union's official statement that it will never be the first to use nuclear arms. And these obligations are essential to Soviet military development and apply to the training of staffs and troops.

As to the statement that the USSR holds that war is an extension of politics, it would be good if the Pentagon theorists claiming to be knowledgeable of the Soviet Union's military policy familiarize themselves with Mikhail Gorbachev's works in which it is stated clearly that the formula of Clausewitz that was classical for his time, that war is an extension of politics by different means, has become outdated, and that military solution of international contradictions is impossible, that nuclear war cannot be the means of achieving political, economic, ideological or any other aims.

All this shows that Soviet military doctrine has nothing in common with its interpretation by the Pentagon. The attempt to present the USSR to the American public in a wrong light, as an "enemy image," to create an impression of a "danger" allegedly posed by the USSR is a familiar method. It is only strange that they on the Potomac continue these exercises in misinformation, rigging of facts and outright lies even now that the prospects of advancement to a nuclear weapons free, secure and stable world have opened.

**'Offhand Attacks' Prevent Good Summit Atmosphere**  
*LD010124 Moscow in English to North America*  
2200 GMT 30 Apr 88

[*"Moscow Viewpoint"* by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] A short while ago when Secretary of State George Shultz was in Moscow I had another, fourth, interview with him, screened by Soviet television, writes Valentin Zorin. The discussion covered many issues largely dealing with the planned visit by President Reagan and the pending Soviet-American summit. On the significance of dialogue between the two countries' leaders, George Shultz had this to say:

[Begin recording] This fourth summit meeting is a part of a basic shift of gears in the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. Take yourself back to the Geneva summit in November 1985 and compare the situation now with the situation then and look at the [word indistinct] of things that have been done and look at the increased confidence that we can resolve problems together if we work at it. And I think when you make that comparison you see that something of great importance has taken place and undoubtedly this Moscow summit will be very much a part of that fundamental process. [end recording]

People here in Moscow share this view of the American secretary of state. We hope the new summit will set forth the process of Soviet-American relations as it was launched in Geneva and continued in Reykjavik and

Washington. However, the past few weeks have added a few difficulties connected with the talks on the agenda of the future summit, those concerning the atmosphere around the Moscow talks. And I believe, continues Valentin Zorin, one could well have done without such difficulties.

I have in mind President Reagan's statements made in Springfield and some others. These were of an openly propagandist nature and contained offhand attacks on Soviet policy. This, of course, cannot possibly create a good atmosphere on the eve of the Moscow summit. When interviewing Secretary of State Shultz I called his attention to these circumstances. Later I asked my American acquaintances now in Moscow why the White House had pulled anti-Soviet propaganda stereotypes out of the archives to repeat them just before another summit. What I heard were attempts to explain this by internal political motives connected with the current presidential campaign; namely, the President's unwillingness to quarrel with influential right-wing leaders.

But I find it difficult to agree to just justification. I think any political maneuvering is not permissible in what concerns the prevention of a nuclear holocaust or the strengthening of universal peace, writes Valentin Zorin. This, by the way, reminds me of past experiences; namely, of the various provocations to which U.S. opponents of Soviet-American movement toward better relations used to resort, and importantly at the most crucial moment. One example is the notorious Powers spy flight that once disrupted a Soviet-American summit. Another example is more recent. Only hours before the first Gorbachev-Reagan summit in Geneva in 1985 the press made public a letter where the U.S. former Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger urged President Reagan to reject any disarmament deal with the Soviet Union.

One, of course, would like to hope that common sense and responsibility will prevail in those groups in the United States that influence that country's foreign policy. As for the Soviet people, they welcome the new meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan and wish it every success.

**Adamishin, Crocker Hold 'Constructive' Talks**  
*LD301252 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT*  
29 Apr 88

[Text] London April 29 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister A.L. Adamishin and Assistant Secretary of State of the United States Chester Crocker exchanged views on a number of topical problems in Africa, including the situation in the south of the continent and the Horn of Africa.

Their meeting was held within the framework of Soviet-American contacts preceding the summit in Moscow.

Main attention was given to ways of assisting countries involved in conflicts to find fair political solutions facilitating the consolidation of their independence and security.

The consultations were substantive. They were held in a constructive atmosphere.

**Adamishin Rejects NATO Claims**

*LD301545 Moscow World Service in English  
1500 GMT 30 Apr 88*

[Text] A Soviet deputy foreign minister has said that the signing of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan represent a breakthrough in the endeavors to settle regional conflicts.

Speaking at a news conference following his talks in London with the British foreign secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, and the American under secretary of state, Chester Crocker, Anatoliy Adamishin refuted the allegations made at the recent session in Brussels of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group that the Soviet Union intends to turn its intercontinental ballistic missiles into medium-range ones to compensate for the nuclear weapons subject to elimination under the INF Treaty.

He referred to the Soviet proposal to the West to exchange data on nuclear, chemical, and conventional arms with a view to reduce their amount to equally minimal levels.

**Zholkver on Media Propaganda at NATO Meeting**

*LD292136 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian  
1500 GMT 29 Apr 88*

[Text] [Announcer] Voice of America programs have recently been regurgitating the allegation that the Soviet Union is sparing no effort to modernize its armed forces. This statement was made by the Pentagon chief, Carlucci, at the meeting of the NATO group engaged in nuclear planning, which was held recently in Brussels. What is the matter here? I have asked our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver to answer this question. Over to you, please:

[Zholkver] I think you have almost given an answer. The Voice of America commentaries that you have mentioned were a kind of propaganda limbering-up exercise to get ready for the Brussels meeting. Indeed, what did they talk about at this session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group? They talked about implementing plans for the modernization of NATO nuclear armaments. These plans, as they have just recalled in Brussels, were actually prepared in March, 1983, at the meeting of NATO military experts in the Canadian city of Montebello, but since then the world situation has considerably changed. Take the Soviet-U.S. treaty on eliminating two classes of nuclear missiles. The world public rated it as a

historic breakthrough on the path to curbing the arms race. Indeed, the talks on reducing other types of nuclear and conventional weapons are being accelerated.

[Announcer] Let us note, however, that along with this an opposite process is underway. Those who adhere to the policy of force, as is obvious from President's Reagan latest speeches, do not at all intend to give up their positions.

[Zholkver] Yes, indeed. The military industrial complexes in the United States and in other NATO countries are alarmed about the fate of their profits. They are seeking new ways of manufacturing weapons. For example, in the United States, as has been admitted by the same Carlucci, new nuclear short-range systems are being developed. Aviation concerns of Britain, the FRG, Italy, and Spain have announced their plans for joint production of new combat aircraft of the nineties, so called Euro-fighters. Here is a question: How can one attain the support of the public, parliamentarians, and governments of the NATO countries for all these plans for a new spiral of the arms race?

For example, the Danish parliament, literally right before the present meeting of the Nuclear Planning Group, spoke against ships carrying nuclear weapons anchoring in the country's ports. In other NATO countries one can hear loud and clear the voices of public and government circles calling to reduce rather than build up nuclear weapons.

These are the conditions that require painstaking propaganda work to influence public opinion through radio broadcasts and other mass media. In this particular case, they were engaged in spreading misinformation about some sort of modernization of the USSR's Armed Forces. You know, the remarkable thing is that a DPA correspondent writes in his report from Brussels that this modernization was what the Pentagon chief used to justify his calls for NATO modernizing its nuclear forces.

[Announcer] In my view the plan of this unseemly propaganda campaign is clear.

[Zholkver] Yes, what is left for me to add is that our country—this has been stressed many times lately, including, I recall, during the recent talks with the U.S. Secretary of State Shultz—is against the policy of force and for the new political thinking in international relations.

In the context of the above commentary and to continue it, I wish to draw your attention to a report from Washington. It says that the Pentagon published today its regular annual edition entitled Soviet Military Power, this time its subtitle being Assessment of a Threat.

Demogogy and theorizations are accompanied by color diagrams, drawings, and maps in great quantities. They are aimed to frighten people with the fact that the United States is lagging behind the Soviet Union and NATO is behind the Warsaw Pact countries in almost all parameters.

It is incredible that neither the December meeting in Washington between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, nor concluding the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, nor the work carried out on an agreement to reduce the strategic arsenals of the two countries, nor constant meetings between the foreign ministers, nor the Moscow summit drawing near, had any effect whatsoever on the contents of this annual publication. The seventh annual edition of the Pentagon comprises the same misinformation exercises, forged facts, and frank [otkrovennyy] lies. Such publications, of course, can do nothing but harm Soviet-U.S. relations.

**Gulf Naval Force Given 'Greater Scope'**  
*LD301533 Moscow TASS in English 1442 GMT  
30 Apr 88*

[Text] Washington April 30 TASS—President Reagan conferred with his leading national security advisers on Friday. It was decided to give greater scope to operations of the U.S. Naval Task Force in the Persian Gulf. Provision is made for U.S. Navy ships to give protection to ships flying a non-American flag if they are attacked. Until now the U.S. Navy escorted U.S.-flagged Kuwaiti tankers in the Persian Gulf.

Later on U.S. Defence Secretary Frank Carlucci officially confirmed that the President instructed the U.S. Navy to provide assistance under certain circumstances to 'friendly neutral vessels' flying a non-belligerent flag in the Persian Gulf and the Strait of Hormuz.

The U.S. defence secretary's statement points out that "following a request from the vessels under attack, assistance will be rendered by a U.S. warship or aircraft if this unit is in the vicinity".

Frank Carlucci maintained that "we are not a policeman in the Gulf, nor do we wish to be" and that "this policy should not be construed as a tilt in either direction in the war" between Iran and Iraq.

However, U.S. actual actions in the explosive region are at variance with the declarations of the Pentagon chief. The ASSOCIATED PRESS news agency emphasizes that it is believed that the new policy is spearheaded against Iran.

Eleven days ago the United States carried out a large-scale military action against that country, destroying several Iranian oil-production platforms in the Persian Gulf by naval artillery and rocket strikes from aircraft.

Six Iranian navy ships were sunk or damaged. Frank Carlucci stated that the administration's decision would not require increase in U.S. current force levels.

The U.S. Naval Task Force in the Persian Gulf and the adjacent areas of the Arabian sea comprises up to 30 ships, including the aircraft carrier enterprise.

**Weekly EKHO PLANETY Interviews Shultz**  
*LD300954 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 0833 GMT 30 Apr 88*

[Text] Moscow, 30 Apr (TASS)—The Soviet Union and the United States "will have to discuss a considerable number of extremely important matters. And that's not surprising: If they had been easy, they would have been solved by now," declared U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. During his recent visit to the USSR, he gave an interview to a TASS diplomatic correspondent, which is published in the latest issue of the TASS weekly 'EKHO PLANETY.'

"Awaiting solution are problems of a general nature—what to do about sea-based cruise missiles, and how to count air-launched cruise missiles. Then there are the problems connected with the ABM Treaty—especially how to formulate the permitted activities of the sides during the period of nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty. We have agreed on nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty for a lengthy period. Apart from that, it is important to see that the sides establish a good mutual understanding. And we are seeking to achieve results in these two directions," George Shultz said.

"Those who are party to the talks face a whole series of problems and questions in the field of verification [kontrol]," he continued. "Both the Soviet and the U.S. sides are determined to set up procedures that will enable each of them to feel confident—if something has been agreed on, it must become a reality. In this connection, verification [kontrol] measures and the INF Treaty have been discussed with unprecedented care."

The U.S. secretary of state believes that "a treaty on strategic offensive weapons is considerably more difficult, it is easier to violate and therefore it is necessary to get used to it, it must be well thought out. We have moved forward in the area of strategic offensive weapons but so far this has been the essential rough work which cannot be avoided. Someone's hasty opinion—let's not do it that way, let's do it another way—can hardly be suitable on this topic."

Speaking about his meetings and talks with Soviet political figures, George Shultz noted: "Since July 1985, Mr Shevardnadze and I have met 25 times. That is sufficient time to get to know each other well. We have had to work together resolving extremely difficult problems in a high tense atmosphere. Naturally, during such a mutually



testing time trust in one's partner develops. On the agenda were very tough questions concerning relations between our countries, yet we managed to find a resolution."

The U.S. secretary of state shared his impressions of his trip round the USSR and to the Ukraine in particular, saying: "The monument at Babiy Yar made an immense impression on me. I was told that every year on 9 May, people in the Soviet Union remember their dear ones, people bring flowers to the graves. It seems important to me that we constantly remind ourselves that what happened in Babiy Yar could happen again. War is inhuman. We must remind each other that we do not want a repetition of Babiy Yar."

### China

#### Border Talks in Beijing End 30 April

LD010906 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 0850 GMT 1 May 88

[Text] Beijing, 1 May (TASS)—The second session of the working group at the negotiations between USSR and PRC government delegations on border issues was held here from 11 to 30 April.

In a businesslike atmosphere, the sides discussed issues concerning the eastern segment of the border between the two countries.

The Soviet participants in the working group were received by Zhou Nan, PRC vice minister of foreign affairs.

#### Journalists From Trade Union Paper Visit USSR

PM291547 Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Apr 88 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Guests From the PRC"]

[Text] A delegation from GONGREN RIBAO, the central PRC trade union newspaper, headed by Li Ji, editor in chief and member of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, has been in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the TRUD editorial board. The visitors from China visited Leningrad, Vilnius, Kaunas, Sukhumi, and Zugdidi and were familiarized with the activity of trade union organizations and labor collectives. Processes linked with the restructuring of the Soviet economy and the development of democracy and glasnost and also the role of Soviet trade unions at the contemporary stage evoked particular interest among the Chinese journalists.

The GONGREN RIBAO delegation's stay in the USSR took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere, and there was a sincere exchange of opinions on questions of mutual interest. Yet another step has been taken toward strengthening contacts between the two countries' trade union press.

AUCCTU Secretary V.M. Mishin received the delegation of Chinese journalists.

#### Memorandum on Cooperatives Signed 28 Apr

OW3004190288 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] A memorandum on resuming cooperation between Soviet and Chinese consumers' cooperatives was signed in Beijing on 28 April. The Soviet and Chinese cooperative organizations will conduct barter trade in the border areas between the two countries.

#### Zhao Comments on China's Ethnic Problems

PM291537 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 88  
First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "For National Cohesion"]

[Text] Beijing, 25 Apr—The first all-China conference devoted to questions of strengthening national cohesion opened here today.

It was addressed by CPC Central Committee General Secretary Zhao Ziyang. While noting the significant development of areas inhabited by ethnic minorities during the years of people's power, he stated nonetheless that "the nationalities question in China did not disappear by itself following the establishment of the socialist system." The quest for ways of resolving it correctly is of great importance in terms of ensuring stability in the country.

There are currently 56 nationalities living in the PRC, with the Han constituting more than 90 percent of the population. All the nationalities have the common destiny and common history of one state. Therefore, the few people in China who hope to see the country split represent the interests not of their own ethnic groups but of anti-Chinese forces abroad. Their intrigues are doomed to complete failure, the CPC leader stressed.

Touching on the tasks of promoting the economic development of ethnic areas, Zhao Ziyang admitted that the uneven economic development of the country will continue for a long time yet. Coastal areas are being given priority at the moment, and the gap between them and the outlying national areas will increase. But the advantages that the coastal areas will obtain should be used to develop the whole of China, including ethnic areas.

#### Private Enterprise Expanding in PRC

LD281709 Moscow World Service in English  
1110 GMT 28 Apr 88

[Kulikov commentary]

[Text] Collective and private enterprises play an increasingly active role in China's economy. Our Beijing correspondent Vladimir Kulikov comments:



In the past few months alone, private industrialists and traders in the Chinese capital have hired for work at their facilities some 15,000 persons. People are attracted by the opportunity to earn more, even if they have to work harder than at the state-owned facilities. China does much to raise the workers' interest in the results of their labor.

The idea of letting industrial and office workers become shareholders led to somewhat unexpected developments. It has been taken into account that some workers have not enough money to buy such shares and receive a corresponding part of profits gained by their facilities. At the musical instruments factory in the city of Changzha, for instance, it is possible to obtain shares not for cash but at the expense of greater labor effort, rationalization proposals and other forms of production activity. An interesting experiment is taking place in (Shenyun), a city in the northeast of China. A mutual aid fund has been established there. In a matter of days the local workers transferred over 3.5 million yuans to it. For the sake of comparison we'll mention that the average monthly wage in China makes up 120 yuans. The main goal of the fund is to help industrial and office workers solve their everyday problems. The city's trade union center is in charge of the fund.

The brisk activity developed by private industrialists induces the leaders of state-owned plants and factories to react faster to the changes taking place in Chinese society.

### Northeast Asia

**Shevardnadze, Kim Yong-nam Meet, Address Lunch**  
*PM301624 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Soviet-Korean Talks"]

[Text] Talks took place in Moscow on 29 April between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and Kim Yong-nam, member of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee Politburo, vice premier of the Administrative Council, and foreign minister of the DPRK, who is in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

E.A. Shevardnadze spoke of the process of revolutionary renewal of all spheres of the Soviet Union's life and the preparations that are under way in the party and country for the 19th all-union party conference, which is called upon to give a powerful boost to our country's progress.

Kim Yong-nam spoke of the implementation of the program outlined by the Sixth WPK Congress for the eighties, for the development of the economy and culture, and for improving the working people's prosperity, as well as the preparations being made for celebrations marking the 40th anniversary of the DPRK's formation.

Questions of Soviet-Korean relations were discussed, as were topical international problems of mutual interest.

The ministers expressed satisfaction at the dynamic development of all-around cooperation between the USSR and the DPRK under the accords reached at the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and Kim Il-song in Moscow in October 1986. The mutual desire was stressed to further strengthen Soviet-Korean relations on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, in the spirit of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and the DPRK, and in the interests of the two countries' peoples and the whole of world socialism.

The talks, which took place in a businesslike, comradely atmosphere, demonstrated the sides' unanimity in evaluating the present international situation and reaffirmed the desire of the USSR and the DPRK steadily to pursue a policy of peace and consistently to struggle for arms reduction and disarmament.

On the Korean side, support was voiced for the strategy of acceleration and the policy of restructuring in the Soviet Union and for the USSR's constructive approach to resolving tasks of ensuring peace and security on earth, tasks that are vitally important to mankind. Kim Yong-nam noted the historic significance of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and expressed the hope that at the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow an accord will be reached on a radical reduction in strategic offensive arms.

The ministers devoted considerable attention to analyzing the situation in Asia and the Pacific. They stressed that the USSR and the DPRK will continue to collaborate with a view to strengthening security and developing equal cooperation between the countries located there. Kim Yong-nam declared the support of the DPRK for the Soviet Union's Vladivostok initiatives.

The DPRK foreign minister spoke in detail of the steps being taken by the DPRK to lessen tension in the Korean peninsula and achieve national reconciliation between North and South Korea. E.A. Shevardnadze reaffirmed the Soviet Union's unchanging solidarity with the course of the WPK and the DPRK Government of achieving a peaceful settlement of the Korean problem without outside interference. The implementation of the DPRK initiatives on lowering the level of confrontation in the Korean peninsula, in the Soviet side's opinion, would promote the restoration of the Korean people's national unity and the strengthening of peace in the Far East.

On the same day E.A. Shevardnadze gave a luncheon in Kim Yong-nam's honor. V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR ministers, and other officials, as well as the persons accompanying Kim Yong-nam, were among those present.

Addressing the guests, E.A. Shevardnadze said:

We are glad to welcome you to the Soviet Union once again. As the Korean proverb has it, new clothes and old friends are good. Our friendship is a constant, unchanging quantity, and our meetings in Pyongyang and Moscow are convincing evidence of this.

But even a firm, old friendship has to acquire new qualities as time goes on. This process was significantly boosted by the meeting between Comrades M.S. Gorbachev and Kim Il-song in October 1986. The implementation of the fundamental accords reached during that meeting defined the content of much work to enrich bilateral relations.

These relations have a firm basis. The Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance firmly enshrines our allied relationship. On this basis we seek to improve ties in all avenues. The aim is more effective forms of economic cooperation.

It is also necessary to extend contacts between people, especially young people. We see a major reserve in the establishment of closer business ties between the Soviet Far East regions and DPRK provinces.

The new political thinking, determining in-depth reforms in the USSR and other socialist countries, presupposes a fresh approach to cooperation, when the exchange of experience is not only useful, but vitally necessary. The main criterion of our successes is a sociopolitical life which in practice, in all its manifestations, establishes the maximum amount of socialism and develops its original characteristics.

Restructuring as a way of thinking and acting is gaining an ever wider hold on the masses. In this context fundamental significance is attached to the 19th all-union party conference; our party and country are today living by the preparations for it.

We know how vigorously and on what a large scale the Korean people, under the WPK's leadership, are engaged in socialist building. This year is a jubilee year for the DPRK: In September the republic will be 40 years old. This is a festival for us, too. We share our friends' pride in their achievements, in the fact that they have built in the Korean peninsula a socialist country with modern industry, productive agriculture, and developed science and culture.

The USSR and the DPRK act shoulder to shoulder for the sake of peace and security in Asia and the Pacific and throughout the world. The Soviet Union is convinced that the planet's future depends to a tremendous extent on the situation in that region. That is why in his well-known Vladivostok speech M.S. Gorbachev put forward the idea of a comprehensive approach to ensuring Asian security through the efforts of all interested

states. The Soviet Union advocates that politically, the Pacific Ocean should justify its name of "pacific," and that a climate of peaceful, equal cooperation should be established there.

Without any doubt, a start has been made here. But I repeat, it is only a start.

We hope that the present positive developments in Soviet-U.S. relations and the forthcoming summit meeting in Moscow will have a beneficial effect on the situation in Asia, too. We advocate the further development of ties with China; a Soviet-Chinese summit meeting could open up new prospects here. Tremendous potential is inherent in the establishment of multifaceted cooperation between the USSR and Japan.

The well-known initiatives of the DPRK, Mongolia, Afghanistan, the countries of Indochina, India, and the states of ASEAN and the South Pacific Forum are more and more markedly coming together in a single stream, strengthening our conviction that the building of an Asia marked by stable security and active cooperation is not only vitally necessary, but entirely possible.

We proceed on the basis that the imperative of the time, the requirement of the new political thinking in world affairs, is the resolution of problems by peaceful means, the switch from confrontation to dialogue and talks, and the impermissibility of the use of military force—whether it is a question of the Near East, the Iran-Iraq war, the Lao-Thai border dispute, the Cambodian problem, or the situation over the Spratly Islands.

The signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan shows us that regional conflicts can be overcome politically. It is no exaggeration to describe this as an encouraging example of the peaceful resolution of regional crisis situations on the basis of the application of the principles of the new political thinking. The policy of national reconciliation is outgrowing the borders of one country. Here we have in mind the Cambodian problem. The Soviet Union would only welcome the further development of intra-Khmer dialogue, which is called upon to unravel one of the most complex, confused tangles in Asia.

A separate word about the situation in the Korean peninsula, where, unfortunately, a seat of tension persists.

Its prime cause lies in the transformation of the south of the peninsula into a major military base, a nuclear bridgehead for the United States. The process of militarization of South Korea itself is also increasingly intensive. The holding of such large-scale maneuvers as "Team Spirit-88" does nothing to help normalize the situation in the region. It is necessary to put an end altogether to shows of strength throughout the Korean peninsula, as the DPRK proposes.

Like our Korean guests, we consider the elimination of military-political confrontation to be the main thing for the Korean peninsula. That is what the implementation of the idea of transforming the peninsula into a nuclear-free zone would lead to. The DPRK has in essence already declared its territory a nuclear-free zone. Now it is up to Seoul and Washington, that is, it is a question of the removal of the U.S. nuclear arsenal from South Korea. If that happened—and we persistently propose to the Americans that they act in this way—the Soviet Union would be ready, together with the other nuclear powers, to guarantee the nuclear-free status of the Korean peninsula. The creation of a zone free from nuclear weapons in Korea, and also in Southeast Asia, as the ASEAN countries propose, in addition to the nuclear-free zone already proclaimed in the South Pacific, would be a tangible contribution to the widening international movement to rid the planet of nuclear death.

The Soviet Union considers it necessary to establish a constructive intra-Korean dialogue, with the aim of achieving Korea's unity on a peaceful, democratic basis with no outside interference.

To this end, it is important to start talking, and the talking could start with the holding of a broad conference of representatives of the public and the authorities from North and South, as Pyongyang proposes, and with the restoration of contacts at all levels—from top to bottom—with the aim of creating an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust here.

It is only natural to want South Korea to respond to this appeal, to want its potential to be channeled not into stepping up confrontation, but into lessening tension and military confrontation. We hope that the national reconciliation that the DPRK calls for will at last become a reality and that the Korean people's cherished desire—the peaceful unification of the motherland—will come true.

We wholeheartedly wish you success on this path.

In conclusion the minister expressed the desire to further develop the collaboration between the CPSU and the WPK and the indissoluble friendship of the USSR and the DPRK and the Soviet and Korean peoples.

In his reply speech Kim Yong-nam noted that relations of friendship and cooperation between our two countries began to strengthen and develop still more actively after the meeting between Kim Il-sung and M.S. Gorbachev.

The two countries' Foreign Ministries, he went on, have made every effort to implement accords between the leaders of the DPRK and the USSR in past years. Contacts and consultations between us have been close and there have often been exchanges of opinions on questions of mutual interest. All this is graphic evidence of the fraternal relations that exist between us.

The most important question on which the lessening of international tension now depends is the elimination of hotbeds of nuclear war and the defense of peace.

In recent years the Soviet Union has put forward various peace proposals, including those on ending nuclear tests and on nuclear disarmament, on preventing the militarization of outer space, on the total elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of this century, and on turning the Asian and Pacific region into a zone of peace and cooperation.

We express full support for the peace-loving initiatives and measures adopted by the party and government of the Soviet Union in this direction.

The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is a starting point of great significance in the movement against war and for nuclear disarmament.

Since a vast quantity of nuclear weapons are sited in South Korea and our people are subjected to the constant threat of nuclear catastrophe, they have a vital interest in the creation of peace zones in various regions of the planet and in the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Today the aspiration of all peace-loving mankind is disarmament and the lessening of international tension. The relaxation of the international situation in general is inconceivable in isolation from the lessening of regional tensions. In order to preserve lasting peace on the planet it is necessary fully to resolve questions connected with confrontations in all regions of the world where they exist.

However, despite the fact that peace-loving peoples throughout the world unanimously want the speediest resolution of regional conflicts, imperialism's interventionist intrigues prevent this. Until the imperialists demonstrate in practice their adherence to peace, all their statements to this effect will remain mere words. Reality shows that the United States pays particular attention to regional questions that do not directly concern it, but at the same time it continues to avoid the resolution of those problems for which it is directly responsible. We believe that the American imperialists should bear the responsibility for the resolution of the Korean problem, which arose because of their occupation of South Korea.

Today, in order to implement its Asian and Pacific strategy, the United States is constantly exacerbating the situation in the Korean peninsula. The United States and the South Korean puppets have gradually extended the joint "Team Spirit" military exercises against us, and this year, on the pretext of "ensuring the security of the Seoul Olympics," they are fanning military hysteria without precedent in history. This graphically indicates



that the United States is trying to perpetuate the division of Korea by any possible means and to continue to hold on to South Korea as a nuclear advance post in the region.

If the United States really wants to lessen tension in the Korean peninsula, it should withdraw its troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea and stop erecting obstacles to the peaceful reunification of Korea.

The division of Korea is a hotbed of war, the reunification of Korea is a guarantee of peace. The imperialists are now using coalition forces to try to preserve this hotbed of war and achieve the goal of "cross-recognition" of the two Koreas.

Ensuring peace and security in the Korean peninsula, where the danger of nuclear war is particularly clearly perceptible, is of great significance for improving the situation in the Asian and Pacific region and for the relaxation of international tension in general.

Today's situation requires the peoples of the socialist countries and peace-loving peoples throughout the world to pool their efforts to struggle more actively than ever before to put an end to the threat of nuclear war that persists in the Korean peninsula.

The DPRK Government, proceeding on the basis of the noble mission of peace, will make every effort to secure the withdrawal of U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea, thwart the intrigues of internal and external splitters to stabilize a situation where two Koreas exist, and put an end to the division of the Korean peninsula, which is a hotbed of war.

We are confident that the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries will continue, as in the past, to give us active support and display solidarity with our people's just cause, for the implementation of autonomous, peaceful reunification.

Let us take this opportunity to express active support for the just cause of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America and other peoples of the world who are fighting against the imperialists' policy of aggression and war, for peace and democracy, for national independence, and for the building of the new society. We also express firm solidarity with the antiwar, antinuclear peace movement in vast regions of the world.

Today we began useful talks with the USSR foreign minister, in an atmosphere full of a sincere, comradely feeling. Our talks will undoubtedly yield noteworthy results.

The tireless strengthening and development of Korean-Soviet friendship—that is the immutable stance of the WPK and the DPRK Government.

Our people will continue to make every effort to widen and develop in every way the relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

Kim Yong-nam expressed confidence that this visit to the Soviet Union will be another important contribution to the implementation of the Korean-Soviet accords reached at the highest level.

The luncheon took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

### Southeast Asia & Pacific

**Thai Prime Minister To Visit 16-22 May**  
*LD011559 Moscow TASS International Service*  
*in Russian 1500 GMT 1 May 88*

[Text] [No dateline as received]—Prem Tinsulanon, prime minister of Thailand, will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union 16-22 May this year at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

**Gerasimov Views Cambodian Issue, Thai Relations**  
*BK0105074688 Bangkok THE NATION in English*  
*1 May 88 p 2*

[By Kawi Chongkitthawon]

[Excerpts] Honolulu—"We are not there," Soviet spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said of the Kampuchean problem.

Gerasimov's statement reasserted the Soviet position on the 9-year-old Kampuchean conflict that since Moscow is not directly involved in Kampuchea, it does not have much influence in settling problems there.

In an interview with THE NATION Gerasimov, information chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, said the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan "is basically a political decision and nothing else."

He said a positive solution to the Afghan problem will serve as a model for national reconciliation in war-torn Kampuchea.

Known for his wit and style, Gerasimov was invited to address the annual meeting last week of the American Newspaper Publisher's Association in Waikiki, Hawaii. He inspired American publishers to laugh at and applaud his humorous one-liners.

He said later that the Soviet Union wants to see improvement in Thai-Soviet relations, and that the upcoming visit to Moscow of Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon will be crucial.

"Certainly, the Kampuchean problem will be discussed in a frank manner," he said.



"The Kampuchean problem will soon be solved," Gerasimov said. "Vietnam has pledged to withdraw from Kampuchea within 1990."

He said Soviet ties with Indochinese countries should not be an obstacle to the betterment of friendship between the Soviet Union and ASEAN countries.

He called the Pacific region a crucial area with which the Soviet Union wants to cooperate fully. "Southeast Asian nations can also play a role in the development of the Soviet Union's Far East region," he said. [passage omitted]

The same day as Gerasimov's Waikiki address, Adm Ronald Hays, commander in chief of the US Navy's Pacific Command, also made a speech at the publisher's meeting, and focused exclusively on the Soviet threat in the Pacific region and on the US military beef-up to counter the Soviet influence.

Hays also accused the Soviet Union of military expansionism in the Pacific.

"But if you look at it from our point of view, it's the other side," Gerasimov responded in the interview.

He disputed Hays's claim of increased Soviet military activities from Vladivostok to Cam Ranh Bay. He said Hays's remark about increased military power "is so impressive that the 'Soviet threat' does not count."

The Soviet spokesman said that if there has been any growth in Soviet military power in the Pacific, it is simply to counter the US military.

Asked if the Soviets would close down their Vietnamese bases in Cam Ranh Bay and Da Nang in exchange for an American pullout from Clark Air and Subic Naval bases in the Philippines, Gerasimov shrugged, "Why not?"

But he said the United States, rather than say "expansionism," uses the term "forward deployment"—its phrase for sea-based staging facilities in the Indian Ocean. [passage omitted]

**Afghanistan Accord Significant for Cambodia**  
*OW2804101388 Moscow in Mandarin*  
*to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 27 Apr 88*

[Belov commentary]

[Text] It has been more than 10 days since the signing in Geneva of the international accord on mediating the situation in Afghanistan. It is pointed out in the Soviet Government statement released today that political leaders and world public opinion have actually evaluated the event as one of extremely great international significance. In this connection, Belov, an observer of this station, writes:

I wish to give prominence to three factors that corroborate the Asian countries' good attitude in approaching the Geneva accord:

First, when they realize that the accord provides the prospects that peace can be quickly restored in Afghanistan, they all sighed with relief. This is because it is no longer a secret that in many international conferences—including some Asian conferences—the vigorous debates on Afghanistan have more often than not proceeded at the expense of other important issues on the agendas.

Second, the world is convinced that the USSR and the United States have reached a compromise on an issue which was deemed insolvable only yesterday. Indonesia's JAKARTA POST, for example, asks: What in the Geneva accord gives people high hopes? The answer is: It is the proven possibility that, by demonstrating goodwill, the USSR and the United States can enter into agreement on complex issues.

Everyone knows that many Asian political leaders have still been trying to justify their negative stand and looking for excuses for not becoming involved in (Soviet-U.S. disputes). Now they have no such justification regarding the Afghanistan issue.

Third—which I think is the most important—everybody has come to realize that the significance of the Geneva accord has in fact far exceeded the scope of the Afghanistan issue alone, and that it has a direct bearing on all regional conflicts. As far as Asia is concerned, everyone certainly knows very clearly what regional conflicts are. They are a ruthless scourge causing more and more bleeding wounds in the limbs of the Asian continent. While we genuinely hope that the Geneva accord can soon extinguish the Afghanistan conflict, there are still the Cambodian and Lebanese issues, the Iran-Iraq war, and the explosive situation on the Korean peninsula; and all these conflicts have been taking away people's lives and obstructing the development of new countries every day and every hour. These conflicts have created the most unfavorable background for the settlement of the most important global issues, such as the struggle against nuclear threat, disarmament, development, and the establishment of a new and just international economic order.

Following the signing of the Geneva accord, I think Asia will approach the world in a new perspective, and this gives us the hope that sound thinking will achieve victories not only in southwest Asia and the vicinity of Afghanistan, but in the Asian continent and other regions as well.

Following the signing of the Geneva accord, Indian and Vietnamese leaders who had just met have taken note that these documents are enormously significant for the settlement of the Cambodian issue. This is of course not accidental. We must realize that what has actually been discussed is that talks should go on so that ways and

means can be found to settle conflicts, so that no retreat shall be made in face of difficulties, and so that a stalemate shall not be created by these difficulties.

Let us take a look at what has been achieved on the Cambodian issue. The greatly impressive progress Heng Samrin and Samdech Sihanouk have achieved in their first two rounds of talks has been shelved and has not been properly exploited. The talks have been interrupted, and the interruption took place not by the fault of the Government of the People's Republic of Cambodia. Phnom Penh has on more than one occasion stated its readiness to continue the discussion, which had actually entered the practical stage. Vietnam and ASEAN members have also proposed that a meeting of the four sides of Cambodia be held in Jakarta. Meanwhile, Vietnam is getting ready to attend the second stage of this meeting in accordance with the wish of Cambodia's opposition factions; and India has been mediating for the sake of organizing another round of talks between Heng Samrin and Sihanouk. We can see what ample feasibilities there are for progress! However, these have not been taken advantage of. I think the example set by the Geneva accord will compel all sides to cherish the political capital that has been accumulated, because one very important requirement here is that we must not waste time. In this regard, all the parties involved in the signing of the Geneva accord have never wasted any time.

#### **New Ambassador to Cambodia Appointed**

PM291517 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 88  
Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "Chronicle"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has nominated Comrade Rashit Luftulovich Khamidulin as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium relieved Yuriy Ivanovich Razdukhov of the duties of USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the People's Republic of Kampuchea upon his retirement.

#### **U.S. Threatens Philippines Over Bases**

LD300645 Moscow TASS in English 1523 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Manila April 29 TASS—Speaking to representatives of the Philippine financial quarters here, Nicholas Platt, U.S. Ambassador to Manila, tied an increase in U.S. investments in the Philippine economy to the solution of the issue on the future status for the U.S. military bases in that country.

He said that the share of U.S. investments in the Philippine economy, which now amounts to 57 per cent of all foreign investments, can be reduced if the United States has to limit its military presence in the archipelago. U.S.

companies closely follow the round of the Philippine-U.S. negotiations on the status of U.S. bases under way in Manila at present, Nicholas Platt stressed.

The local mass media described this statement by the U.S. ambassador as a new attempt to put pressure on the Philippine leadership in the question of the future of the Pentagon military facilities.

#### **Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Philippines**

##### **Gilashvili Arrival Statement**

PM011249 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 88  
Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Interparliamentary Links"]

[Text] Manila, 28 Apr—A delegation of Soviet parliamentarians headed by P.G. Gilashvili, which arrived here today, will be discussing in meetings with representatives of the Philippine Congress and government questions of international relations, the situation in the Asian-Pacific region, interparliamentary links, and bilateral cooperation.

We have come to the Philippines to talk about the colossal transformations taking place in our country and to discuss the problems of this region to which the Soviet Union also belongs, P.G. Gilashvili said at the airport.

The paramount task of our visit, the Soviet delegation head noted, is to try to understand one another better. It is this that serves as the foundation for the further development of Soviet-Philippine relations.

After Manila and Jakarta, the Soviet parliamentarians will again visit Singapore, where they will continue the exchange of opinions with members of parliament.

##### **Visit Ends**

LD010049 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian  
2200 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] A visit to the Philippines by a group of the USSR Supreme Soviet has ended. In a conversation with Manglapus, secretary of foreign affairs, Salonge, president of the senate, and deputies of both chambers of congress, there was discussion of a broad range of issues pertaining to the international situation and the efforts of the Soviet Union directed at strengthening peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region.

**Further Reportage on Razumovskiy Talks in Hanoi**

**PRAVDA Reports Talks**

PM291243 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 88  
Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange Of Opinions"]

[Text] Hanoi, 25 Apr—The exchange of opinions continued here today between the CPSU delegation visiting Vietnam, headed by G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and a Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV) delegation headed by Nguyen Duc Tam, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPV Central Committee.

G.P. Razumovskiy talked about the Soviet communists' preparations for the upcoming big event in the life of the CPSU and the entire Soviet people, the 19th all-union party conference, which will be an important stage in the elaboration of the theory and practice of restructuring, the implementation of the radical economic reform, and the development of the processes of democratization and glasnost. He dwelt in detail on questions of the CPSU's organizing and leading activities connected with overhauling thinking, increasing the role of the human factor, strengthening party ranks, broadening constructive criticism and self-criticism, and eliminating the command-and-administer and bureaucratic style and other negative phenomena in public life.

The sides noted that, for all the differences between the social-political and economic situations in the two countries, the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and Vietnam must deal with essentially similar tasks. In this connection there was unanimous emphasis on the special significance of the further expansion and strengthening of interparty links and constant exchange of experience in the matter of implementing the 27th CPSU Congress and 6th CPV Congress decisions geared to fundamentally restructuring and thoroughly overhauling all spheres of life.

USSR Ambassador to the SRV D.I. Kachin participated in the talks, which took place in an atmosphere of comradeship and mutual trust.

On the same day, the CPSU delegation visited the site of the Hoabinh hydroelectric power station, the biggest in Southeast Asia, which is being constructed on the Black River with help and technical assistance from the USSR. The Soviet visitors looked round the site where the future giant power facility is being constructed and familiarized themselves with the living and everyday conditions of the Soviet specialists working in Hoabinh. A conversation was held with the leaders of the project during which there was an examination of the questions of ensuring the prompt and high-quality fulfillment of the plan targets facing the international collective.

In Hanoi the delegation members visited the Museum of the Revolution, where they signed the Honored Visitors' Book.

**Demichev Meets Returning Plane**

LD292354 Moscow Television service in Russian  
1700 GMT 29 Apr 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Razumovskiy-led CPSU delegation returned today to Moscow from Ho Chi Minh. The delegation was in Vietnam at the invitation of the Vietnam Communist Party Central Committee. At the airport, the delegation was met by Comrade Demichev and other officials.

**Near East & South Asia**

**UN Observers Arrive in Afghanistan 1 May**

LD010847 Moscow TASS in English 0929 GMT  
1 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 1 TASS—A group of U.N. observers have come to Kabul today to see to implementation of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan.

The group is led by Major-General Rauli Helminen (Finland) and senior political adviser Benon Sevan (Cyprus). Answering journalists' questions at Kabul airport, Rauli Helminen underlined that he was optimistic about prospects of compliance with the Geneva agreements.

Our main task is to help the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan, all parties concerned to solve any problems, to remove difficulties and iron out misunderstandings, should these arise.

**Wakil Promises Assistance**

LD020845 Moscow TASS in English 0818 GMT  
2 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 2 TASS—Foreign Minister of the Republic of Afghanistan 'Abdul Wakil has had a meeting here with head of the group of the U.N. observers to see to implementation of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan Major-General Rauli Helminen.

'Abdul Wakil expressed gratitude to the U.N. secretary general and his personal representative for their profound contribution to the signing of the Geneva agreements and assured Rauli Helminen that Afghanistan was ready to honour all articles of the agreement and render the necessary assistance to the group of U.N. observers.



**Afghan Leaders' Reply Message on Revolution Day**  
*PM011309 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 1*

[Message from Afghan President Najibullah and Prime Minister Keshmand thanking Soviet leaders for April revolution anniversary congratulations]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Comrade A.A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

Dear Comrades,

Personally and on behalf of the Afghan people and the country's leadership, we express cordial gratitude for your warm and friendly congratulations on the Afghan people's national holiday—the 10th anniversary of the April national democratic revolution in Afghanistan.

Ten years of revolutionary transformations have changed the face of Afghanistan and strengthened our motherland's sovereignty and independence. The historically evolved traditional relations of good-neighborliness between the Afghan and the Soviet peoples have acquired depth and scale over the years of the revolution. The Soviet Union's support for our initiatives and proposals in the international arena has had a great impact on the process of a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. The Soviet Union's contribution to the successful conclusion of the Geneva talks is inestimable. The Soviet Union's all-around support for and solidarity with our struggle will remain forever in the grateful Afghan people's memory.

The joint efforts of the Soviet and the Afghan Governments in normalizing the situation around Afghanistan have demonstrated to the whole world the possibility of resolving acute regional conflicts if the interested sides show good will and realism. The reassuring prospect of the peaceful settlement of numerous regional conflicts and the improvement of the entire international climate is being opened up before the international community.

The people of Afghanistan are fully determined to continue the course aimed at restoring national peace in the country, continuing the process of normalizing the situation in the region, and ensuring stability and security throughout the world. The people of Afghanistan ardently support the Soviet Union's efforts to improve the international situation and its struggle to create a nonviolent, secure world. Afghan-Soviet cooperation will continue to serve as an example of friendly, equitable, and mutually advantageous relations between peoples. The Tashkent statement of 7 April 1988 opens a new stage in the development of Afghan-Soviet relations.

We wish the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Soviet Government, the entire Soviet people, and you personally, dear comrades, successes in your indefatigable activity to renew Soviet society and in your struggle for peace and security for all the peoples of the planet.

Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan and general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee

S.'A. Keshmand, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Afghanistan

**Najibullah Rejects Possibility of Rebel Takeover**  
*PM021227 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88*  
*First Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "The Road to Peace Is Clear. Najibullah Press Conference"]

[Excerpts] Kabul, 29 Apr—President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan gave a news conference for foreign journalists on Thursday in connection with the celebrations of the 10th anniversary of the April Revolution. [passage omitted]

In reply to a question from an AP correspondent as to whether the president intended to leave Afghanistan if the opposition refused to take part in a coalition government and seized power in Kabul, Najibullah replied that he did not. This, he said, was in answer to the first part of the question; the second part of the question did not deserve to be answered in detail. Kabul has never been seized, nor will it be seized. It is in the reliable hands of the people's power, and no one should doubt this. The correspondents have seen life in Kabul for themselves: The city is living, building, working, and learning. This is one of the most important gains of the revolution, Najibullah noted.

**U.S. Arms Supplies to Afghan Rebels Condemned**  
*PM011303 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 7*

[V. Shurygin rejoinder: "Ink Not Yet Dry...."]

[Text] The ink was not yet dry, as they say, on the Geneva agreements on a political settlement around Afghanistan when AP reported from Islamabad that the United States is airlifting emergency arms supplies to the Afghan insurgents to compensate for their losses as a result of the explosion at the arsenals near Islamabad on 10 April this year.

It is hard to expect anything good from the agreement that has been signed if the contracting parties start piling up difficulties in the way of its realization. This thought occurs to you as soon as you read this report. You cannot help turning to the texts of the "Geneva package" on Afghanistan.



One of the documents, which is signed "G. Shultz, for the U.S. Administration," states that the sides "pledge rigorously to refrain from interference and intervention in any form in the internal affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and to respect the pledges contained in the bilateral agreement between the Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on the principle of relations and, in particular, on noninterference and the rejection of intervention."

As for Pakistan, in accordance with the aforementioned Afghan-Pakistani agreement, it is now time for it to set about eliminating the dumps of weapons earmarked for the Afghan rebels, so that there are none left on Pakistani territory by 15 May. But, as we see, the Afghan insurgents' overseas patrons are now doing something that is quite the opposite. With or without the consent of the Pakistani leadership? I cannot understand, therefore, how Washington and Islamabad are thinking of fulfilling the pledges they adopted in Geneva. In any case, the massive weapons deliveries to the Afghan rebels do not point all the participants in the direction of rigorous fulfillment of the Geneva accords, to put it mildly.

**VOA Report on Afghan Weapon Movements Denied**  
*LD301753 Moscow Television Service in Russian*  
*1430 GMT 30 Apr 88*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] This spring has brought hope that there will be peace in Afghanistan. However, this tremendous event of international importance is obviously a worry to some people. Some Western mass media are trying to sow the seeds of doubt as to the possibility of a political settlement of the Afghan problem and to blacken the Soviet Union's actions.

[Correspondent A. Petrova] A Voice of America morning program in Russian on 19 April reported that in recent days, Soviet convoys carrying weapons had been moving along the Jalalabad road toward the Afghan-Pakistani border. [video shows green field, switching to tanks moving along the road; various weapons and charges are shown] The Jalalabad road is the one along which troops will be withdrawn on 15 May.

This road is indeed very busy at present. It is necessary to bring all our various military units together in one place. Therefore, convoys are moving along, but not for engaging in combat actions or delivering weapons to Afghans. Yet convoys of another kind are setting off, one after another, from the Pakistani border along some hidden roads. I have seen the remnants of such a convoy destroyed in a battle.

They have just one goal: to prevent us from pulling out our troops within the timeframes that have been set out and to make them longer. Preparations, of course, are being made to continue the war until the present lawful

power is overthrown. This is what the mujahidin ring-leaders state. Their colleagues in the Voice of America obviously fail to have the most accurate information; in any event, the information they have has not been checked.

But let us listen to the opinion of a professional soldier. [video shows Petrova interviewing a soldier in uniform]

[Lieutenant Colonel O.V. Krivopalov, identified by caption] Indeed, our units and formation, which are getting ready to withdraw to the Soviet Union, are busy removing personnel from posts and lines. Despite the large-scale preparatory work of a purely peaceful nature, for marching back to the homeland, our units, soldiers, and officers must take part in daily combat actions against the military opposition. This opposition, both during the day and during the night, has recently been very active in moving in a great many convoys carrying weapons and ammunition.

Soviet commanders have no ulterior motives as to the future, except those announced by the Soviet Government. All our soldiers are hopeful that they will be returning to their relatives, mothers, and, wives in the near future.

**Afghan Rebel Leader Hikmatyar Denounced**  
*LD291639 Moscow TASS in English 1601 GMT*  
*29 Apr 88*

["TASS News Analyst on Hikmatyar's Statement"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Afghan people have celebrated the 10th anniversary of their revolution. The celebrations were marked by consolidation of the diverse forces of Afghan society on the platform of national reconciliation, the platform which offers the best way towards the long-awaited peace.

The Geneva accords on the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, designed to put an end to any interference in the affairs of Afghanistan, facilitate this process in an active and effective way. What is more, this interference from Pakistani territory, where the so-called "Alliance of the Seven" has settled down, must be curtailed by May 15 this year, when the Soviet troops start withdrawing from Afghanistan.

The signing of the Geneva accords was met with satisfaction worldwide. These agreements are disliked only by those who would like the bloodshed in Afghanistan to continue.

The head of the "Alliance of the Seven," Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, has made fresh hostile attacks against the Geneva accords. He is holding forth, as before, on the "Alliance" rejecting the Geneva accords, preventing the return of refugees and fighting to establish the Islamic

government in Afghanistan. At the same time, Hikmatyar is intimidating the world public with the alleged Soviet plans to "divide" Afghanistan, is stating his intention to attack the Soviet troops during their withdrawal. These bellicose statements are nothing new. They only underline, as the April 27 statement of the Soviet Government pointed out, the absence of the feeling of responsibility for the destinies of the homeland and people.

The "irreconcilables" marked the national holiday of the country, where they were born and grew up, in their own peculiar way. They blew up a truck, crammed full with explosives, in the centre of Kabul, causing a loss of life.

This atrocity has caused an outrage in Afghanistan and many countries of the world.

The world public demands that Afghanistan be left in peace and that subversive-terroristic actions against the people of the country be halted.

It appears that Pakistan, on whose territory the bases of the opposition armed groups are located, must take all this into account. These bases, as is known, will have to go by May 15, 1988, as stipulated by the Geneva accords.

Non-compliance with the Geneva accords will not only cause the continuation of the bloodshed but may also result in entirely unforeseen circumstances for those who are trying to circumvent and violate them.

**PRAVDA Reports Latest Kabul Bomb Incident**  
*PM291531 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 7*

[Own correspondent V. Okulov dispatch: "Truck From Peshawar"]

[Text] Kabul, 28 Apr—Every day 100-150 buses come from various Afghan provinces to this crowded square by the Pamir Movie Theater, where Maiwand Avenue begins. But now it is almost deserted. I look around: A medical center, small stores, a pharmacy, the party committee of the First City Region—these buildings surround the square. The windows are all fragments of glass. On the other side of the square, beyond the parapet, the turbid waters of the Kabul River flow. In places, the parapet has been breached. Vehicle panels and pieces of bodywork are smoking. A crumpled bus is turned on its side. People are sorting through the smoking wreckage, and broken glass crunches beneath their feet. The corpses have already been removed. The injured have been hospitalized. This time three people were killed. Sixteen were injured.

The bomb exploded 27 April, in a crowded midday scene. The charge was in a truck which had arrived from Pakistan. This was determined from its bent number plate. Trade across the border has been taking place throughout the years of the undeclared war against

Afghanistan. So a Pakistani truck in Kabul is commonplace. Only this time, the load was unusual. Although, blasphemous as it may sound, the load was usual, too — what the leaders of the Afghan extremists send from Peshawar to kill their fellow citizens. People over there can be heard shouting right now about continuing the war to its victorious end. Despite the Geneva agreements, despite the hand of reconciliation extended by the Government, despite the will for peace clearly expressed by the overwhelming majority of the people.

**Editorial Hails Achievement of Afghan Accords**  
*PM301400 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 1*

[Editorial: "Horizons of Peace Opened Up in Afghanistan as a Result of the Signing of the Geneva Agreements"]

[Text] Hopes of peace came to Afghanistan with the spring—agreements which should bring a political settlement of the external aspects of the Afghan problem were signed in Geneva on 14 April. This is an event of tremendous international significance. The "Geneva package" incorporates an Afghan-Pakistani agreement on the principles of mutual relations, and in particular on noninterference and renunciation of intervention; an agreement between the same parties on the voluntary return of Afghan refugees; a Soviet-American declaration on international guarantees; and an agreement on interrelationships for a settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan, signed by the Afghan and Pakistani representatives and witnessed by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States. A memorandum of understanding was also adopted, which defines ways in which the United Nations can help to put the "Geneva package" into practice.

"An important breakthrough has been achieved in unblocking one of the most complex present-day regional conflicts, whose echoes were keenly felt far beyond the bounds of the geographical region where it took shape," the recently published Soviet Government Statement says. This conflict brought disaster and suffering to the people of Afghanistan, generated an atmosphere of alarm around it, and stepped up tension in the world. That is why the resolution of this conflict is so important. And therefore, in terms of its international consequences, the signing of the Geneva agreements is entirely comparable with that other very important achievement along the path to universal peace—the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The act accomplished in Geneva reflects the new political thinking that is gaining strength in the world.

The Geneva agreements come into force on 15 May. On that day, the withdrawal of Soviet troops will begin. They arrived at a difficult time for the Afghan people, when the country was under the threat of outside interference. They arrived at the request of its legitimate

government, having an appropriate juridical and legal basis. The Soviet Union, in its policy, has always been true to the principles of internationalism, and this time too its sons honorably fulfilled their international duty to help a neighboring country. That required sacrifices, and the memory of our servicemen who fell on Afghan soil is sacred to all of us. It is the essential duty of party and soviet organs to do everything to ensure that the families of those who died and their friends and relations are surrounded with concern, attention, and kindness.

The Geneva agreements provide for real guarantees of noninterference in Afghan affairs. The Afghan people have received the opportunity to establish peace and consensus in their country. The Soviet soldiers and officers can return home conscious of having done their duty.

A major role in the attainment of agreements on Afghanistan belongs to the policy of national reconciliation, proclaimed and being put into practice by the Afghan Government. It was a bold and courageous act that put the nation's common interests first. It takes into account the Afghan people's national traditions and their bitter experience of recent years, years overshadowed by fratricidal warfare. The Afghan leadership not only called for an end to armed internecine acts, but also offered to share power with the opposition and create a coalition government with the participation of all forces representing Afghan society, that is, together to decide the country's fate and its future. The policy of national reconciliation is essentially a program for creating an independent, neutral, nonaligned Afghanistan, living in peace and concord with all its neighbors. It envisages a multiparty system in the political sphere and a mixed economy for the country.

Of exceptional significance for the attainment of success in Geneva were the 8 February statements made by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Moscow and President Najibullah of Afghanistan in Kabul, which brought the Geneva talks onto a footing of practical decisions. On 7 April, M.S. Gorbachev had a meeting with Najibullah in Tashkent which laid the foundations for a new phase in relations of friendship and cooperation between our countries' peoples and reaffirmed the firm will to settle the Afghan problem.

In the course of the Geneva diplomatic process, the great potential of the United Nations in the settlement of regional conflicts became clear. The mediating role played by the United Nations has been assessed highly by the Soviet Union. In the future, that organization will continue to make efforts to ensure the fulfillment of agreements within the verification and monitoring mechanism.

It is necessary, of course, to be soberly aware that an internal settlement in Afghanistan can be neither simple nor easy. All the more concern is therefore aroused by

the position of the "Alliance of Seven"—the Afghan groupings operating from Pakistani territory. It has adopted a hostile stance with regard to the accords. It is also known that new consignments of weapons, including more modern weapons than those with which they were formerly supplied, have recently been made available to the armed Afghan opposition.

The Geneva documents create all the necessary external conditions for a final political settlement of the Afghan problem. It is now up to all sides to fulfill them strictly. Any deviation from the accords formulated could harm the cause of an Afghan settlement. If each side complies strictly with the commitments it has assumed, the restoration of peace in Afghanistan could become a reality.

The results of Geneva, in today's troubled world, must not be seen solely in the context of a single region, as a way to resolve a single conflict. The approach to the Afghan problem has shown clearly that the method of political settlement of regional conflicts can and should be the key to unraveling tangles in other hot spots too.

The USSR and the United States, participating in the settlement of the Afghan problem and assuming the role of guarantors of what has been achieved, have set a precedent in constructive collaboration. It is common knowledge that much in the world depends on cooperation between the two major powers. But it is specifically constructive collaboration between these powers that is needed to normalize international ties in general. If such collaboration becomes permanent, then third countries will have the opportunity to construct their foreign policy not on the basis of total rivalry, but on the basis of reasonable, realistic collaboration between Moscow and Washington. And that will improve and change the situation on our planet.

The Soviet Union, in taking part in the Geneva process, acted on the desire to strengthen peace. Our country will promote the positive development of events in Afghanistan on the basis of the Geneva accords, and is ready to cooperate with them at a high level, helping the Afghans with the country's economic development and the resolution of other problems, including the refugee problem. It is ready, with a full sense of responsibility, to work for the sake of bringing closer the resolution of other national conflicts and healing these wounds, which are capable of generating gangrenous spots on mankind's body. Our country invites all countries to engage in joint actions in this noble cause.

**Geneva Accord Key To Improved Pakistani Ties**  
*BK0105112388 Moscow In Urdu to Pakistan*  
1100 GMT 30 Apr 88

[(Aleksandr Viniazov) commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners. The 1st day of May marks the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic ties between the Soviet Union and Pakistan. Our commentator (Aleksandr Viniazov) writes: The establishment of



diplomatic relations between Pakistan and the Soviet Union assumed the status of an important event in the promotion of bilateral contacts and reflected the sincere desire of the two people for good-neighborly relations and cooperation. The establishment of diplomatic ties provided good prospects for the consolidation of multifaceted bilateral cooperation in political, economic, trade, and cultural fields. But a review of these past years indicates that these prospects have not been adequately utilized. There have been times when Soviet-Pakistani relations developed rapidly. But on certain occasions, they remained strained for a considerably long period of time.

Pakistani-Soviet relations are also marked by a number of dramatic events. One of the noteworthy events, for example, is the flight of the U.S. U-2 aircraft from the direction of Peshawar toward the Soviet Union, which was later shot down in Soviet airspace. It was obvious that the provocation could not but affect Pakistani-Soviet relations. The incident created serious obstacles to a close relationship between the two countries. However, it can be considered that such dramatic events were not the fallout of the (?strained) relationship between Pakistan and the Soviet Union, but were the outcome of dangers created by outside powers. Whenever the Pakistani leadership has reviewed its position vis-a-vis a single, determined direction and kept in mind the requirements of the country for promoting multilateral contacts, Pakistani-Soviet relations have registered a very positive growth.

Toward the end of the 1950's and in the beginning of the 1970's, there were signs that Pakistan was turning toward a sovereign and independent policy. Pakistan withdrew from military blocs and became a member of the Nonaligned Movement. Undoubtedly, the Pakistani leadership's concerns for national interests were at the root of these steps, but it cannot be forgotten that these farsighted steps in Islamabad's foreign policy had a very positive impact on Pakistan's cordial relations with other countries, including the Soviet Union. Pakistan's economic and trade ties [words indistinct] increased, and they always kept in mind their mutual benefit. Economic projects, including the Karachi steel plant — the largest economic project ever in the history of Pakistan — were constructed in Pakistan with the economic and technical assistance of the Soviet Union. The third block of the Guddu Thermal Power Station is the second major example of Pakistani-Soviet cooperation. Pakistani economists and politicians strongly believe that the implementation of bilateral economic, trade agreements have always benefited Pakistan. But, as they say, the utilization of resources for further expansion of cooperation can be possible only in an atmosphere of improved political relations.

The Afghanistan problem has been the cause of a cold relationship between Pakistan and the Soviet Union. But now the way has been cleared for a tangible settlement of the problem. The signing of the Geneva accord — under

which Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Afghanistan and the outside interference, that is, from Pakistani soil, in the internal affairs of Afghanistan will end — is only the beginning of the settlement. The right approach of the parties concerned and the realistic position taken by the Pakistani leadership and their willingness to keep in mind the interests of all Afghan people contributed to the success of the Geneva negotiations. In a statement after the signing of the accords, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said this trend and Pakistan's scrupulous compliance with the accords will lay a good foundation for improvement in Pakistani-Soviet relations.

The Soviet Union considers Islamabad's willingness to improve bilateral relations positive. Speaking in Karachi recently, Zain Noorani, the Pakistani minister of state for foreign affairs, emphasized that Pakistan desires to maintain and expand good relations with the Soviet Union. The Soviet people, for their part, think that they and their Pakistani counterparts share many common interests in the establishment of peace, expansion of mutual cooperation, strengthening of security and stability in Asia, and in the struggle to prevent nuclear war. It is obvious that Pakistani-Soviet relations will greatly strengthen the atmosphere of trust in the relations among states and will help in the establishment of a common Asian security regime.

In a statement on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic ties between Pakistan and the Soviet Union, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfiliev said the Soviet Union is interested in increasing bilateral constructive cooperation. He said the Soviet Union has always maintained a constructive, sincere, and principled line in relation to Pakistan; and even if Soviet-Pakistani relations have not developed uniformly at all times, valuable experience in political contacts and mutually beneficial cooperation has already been gained.

Complete compliance with the Geneva accords on Afghanistan will provide a congenial atmosphere for turning a new page in the Pakistani-Soviet relationship, Vadim Perfiliev added.

**Soviet-Pakistani Anniversary Messages Exchanged**  
*LD010835 Moscow TASS in English 0655 GMT*  
*1 May 88*

[Text] Moscow May 1 TASS—The Council of Ministers of the USSR has sent a message to the Prime Minister of Pakistan Muhammad Khan Junejo on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

The message notes the useful experience which has been accumulated by the two countries in the process of mutually beneficial cooperation of long-standing in different areas. The hope is expressed that the relations

between the USSR and Pakistan will be further developed for the good of the peoples of the two countries, in the interests of universal peace and security.

In reply messages to Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov Pakistan's prime minister noted the great significance for his country of many year-long cooperation with the Soviet Union in the development of Pakistan's economy and expressed the hope for further expansion of relations in economy, trade and culture. He highly appreciated the Soviet foreign policy initiatives which resulted in a considerable improvement of East-West relations.

The Government of Pakistan will exert sincere efforts towards consolidating mutually beneficial cooperation with the Soviet Union, the message says.

**U.S. Intends To Continue Supplies to Pakistan**  
*LD021346 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT  
2 May 88*

[Text] New Delhi May 2 TASS—The U.S. Administration has again answered in the negative to India's call to stop heightening tension in south Asia, to reconsider the approach to deliveries of up-to-date armaments to Pakistan now that the Geneva agreements have been signed and the USSR is to withdraw its military contingent from Afghanistan.

An official U.S. representative, the PRESS TRUST OF INDIA reports from New York, has stated there that the White House does not plan a cut in military aid to the Islamabad regime. He said the United States intended to maintain close relations with Pakistan. The Geneva agreements did not signify that American aid to Islamabad was to be cut, he said.

The representative of the American Administration again alleged that Pakistan's security was imperilled by "the unfriendly" government in Kabul. He said Islamabad therefore needed up-to-date armaments which Washington intends to deliver to it before the year of 1993 within the framework of an over 4,000 million dollar military-economic deal.

The U.S. readiness to assist Pakistan's militarisation will lead to a new escalation of tension in the region of south Asia, the PRESS TRUST OF INDIA writes.

**Gandhi Receives Kamentsev in Delhi 29 Apr**  
*LD292234 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian  
1730 GMT 29 Apr 88*

[Text] A working meeting of the co-chairmen of the Soviet-Indian Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation ended in Delhi today. The USSR delegation was headed by Comrade Kamentsev. At the meeting there was discussion of development of new forms of cooperation, such as

industrial co-production, establishment of joint enterprises, and goods exchange operations. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi received Kamentsev today.

The delegation left for Moscow the same day.

**Gromyko Receives Syrian, Libyan Envoys 29 Apr**  
*PM301828 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88  
Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Envoys of Syria and Libya Present Their Credentials"]

[Text] A.A. Gromyko received in the Kremlin on 29 April Muhammad 'Isam al-Na'ib, ambassador of the Syrian Arab Republic, who presented his credentials.

Speaking at the presentation of credentials, the ambassador said that his country is waging a struggle for the return of the Arab territories occupied by Israel and against Israeli hegemonism. Syria supports the initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union in the struggle for the prevention of nuclear war, disarmament, and the lessening of international tension.

He expressed confidence that Syrian-Soviet relations will grow stronger in all spheres: political, economic, cultural, and others.

In his speech A.A. Gromyko stated:

In accepting your credentials, I welcome you as Syrian ambassador to the USSR. I express sincere gratitude for the greetings and warm words about our country, and for the good wishes from President Hafiz al-Asad and the Syrian Government to the people and leadership of the Soviet Union.

There is a saying: If you want to study the history of the world, study Syria. All epochs of history are represented there—from the Stone Age to the present day. Your country is the heir of a once extensive source of ancient material and spiritual culture. Syria is located where three continents meet. It has felt the influence of various great civilizations.

Soviet people note with satisfaction the high level of relations between our countries. These relations are developing on the firm foundations of the Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation and becoming ever more dynamic and fruitful. The space flight by a joint Soviet-Syrian crew was a bright chapter in the history of our friendship. Collaboration between the Soviet Union and Syria in the international arena is strengthening. There is every reason to assert that Soviet-Syrian cooperation for the sake of peace and social progress has become an effective factor in international politics, first and foremost in Near Eastern affairs.

You have come to the Soviet Union at a time when truly revolutionary changes are taking place in our country. Restructuring and the associated democratization and glasnost are lifting socialism to a new level. The new political thinking is confidently forging a path in international affairs too. Its first weighty result was the signing of the treaty on the total elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles by the Soviet Union and the United States.

The normalization of the international situation is impossible without the elimination of conflict situations. One of the most dangerous and protracted conflicts is the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Soviet Union advocates the earliest convocation of a plenipotentiary international conference on the Near East with the participation of all the directly interested parties, including the PLO as sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council.

The task of ending the bloody Iran-Iraq war and normalizing the situation in the Persian Gulf region is also urgent. To this end, UN Security Council Resolution 598 must be implemented in full.

Your country makes a weighty contribution to defending the Arab peoples' legitimate rights and interests. Syria comes out against attempts to substitute separate, partial solutions, which benefit only the aggressor, for a just, comprehensive Near East settlement. For its part, the Soviet Union will continue to give Syria assistance in strengthening sovereignty and independence and in the struggle for the triumph of peace and justice on Near Eastern soil.

I wish to assure you that in your activity aimed at strengthening Soviet-Syrian relations, you will meet with the support of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government. I wish you success in fulfilling this lofty mission, and I ask you to convey wishes for happiness and prosperity from the Soviet people to Comrade Hafiz al-Asad and the Government and friendly people of Syria.

After the presentation of credentials, a conversation took place between A.A. Gromyko and M.I. al-Na'ib, in the course of which the development of Soviet-Syrian relations was discussed. The ambassador observed that these relations are characterized by a friendship so great that it can be likened to a tree with roots deep in the ground and its crown high in the sky.

A.A. Gromyko stated that there is no limit to the improvement of relations. The Soviet Union has always looked with approval on Syria's positions both in international affairs in general and on the Near East settlement in particular. We are confident that that is how it will continue, and therefore we look to the future with optimism.

On the same day A.A. Gromyko received the credentials of Daw 'Ali Suwaydan, secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Bureau of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyyah.

The ambassador gave a high assessment of the position of the friendly Soviet Union, which comes out in favor of the Arabs' just cause, supports their struggle against imperialism and Zionism, and gives assistance to national liberation forces. This policy invariably receives the Arabs' approval and further persuades the people and leadership of the Jamahiriyyah of the correctness of the political course of strengthening relations with the socialist community and with the Soviet Union.

A.A. Gromyko stated in his speech:

In accepting your credentials, I welcome you as secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Bureau of your state in the Soviet Union. I thank you for the warm words and good wishes to the leadership of the Soviet Union and our country's peoples, and also for your support for the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy course. In turn, I ask you to convey best wishes for success and well-being personally to Mu'ammār al-Qadhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, and for progress and prosperity to the friendly people of the Jamahiriyyah.

We know the people of Libya live in harsh natural conditions. Your country has no permanently flowing rivers or large freshwater lakes. In this respect it is one of the few countries with such exceptional natural conditions.

At the same time, your people also live in the harsh conditions of constant imperialist provocations.

I find it particularly gratifying to note that friendly relations have become established between our countries, and Soviet-Libyan cooperation has developed progressively in recent years. An important milestone along this path was the visit to the Soviet Union by Mu'ammār al-Qadhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution. His talks with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a good boost to the expansion of bilateral ties.

There is every reason to believe that we have sufficient experience and opportunities for cooperation in the economic, scientific, technical, and other spheres.

You have come to Moscow at a time when the restructuring process is gathering speed here. Its ideas have spread far beyond the bounds of our country. They exert a positive influence on the state of international relations, while the new political thinking, closely associated with them and based on humane values common to all mankind, is spreading increasingly widely beyond the bounds of the Soviet Union.



The encouraging signs of an improvement in the situation in the globe that have appeared do not mean that reactionary circles are about to relinquish their positions voluntarily. They continue to defend "cold war" positions, cling to strong-arm methods of pressuring regimes that are not to their liking, and do not shrink from direct aggressive actions against them. The Libyan people have experienced this for themselves.

The Soviet Union will continue resolutely to rebuff the intrigues of imperialism and unswervingly to take the side of peoples defending their independence against encroachments from outside and their rights to choose their own path of development independently. The proximity or coincidence of the Soviet and Libyan positions on the global problems of today create favorable prerequisites for our countries' cooperation in the international arena.

People in the Soviet Union know you well as an experienced diplomat who has made a weighty contribution to strengthening Soviet-Libyan relations. You have been here before as diplomatic representative, and we regard your new appointment to Moscow as an indication of the further development of our countries' relations. I wish you great success in your responsible mission. You may be sure that in fulfilling it, you will always have the support and understanding of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government.

After the presentation of credentials, a conversation took place between A.A. Gromyko and D.'A. Suwaydan, in the course of which both sides reaffirmed their commitment to friendship and cooperation. The Libyan envoy observed that his country supports the Soviet Union's positions on questions of disarmament, the strengthening of peace, and the creation of a comprehensive system of international security.

A.A. Gromyko, for his part, gave a high assessment of friendly Soviet-Libyan relations. And if we are to describe the way they are developing, he said, the Russian word "good" ["khorosho"] could well be applied to this process.

Taking part in the presentation of credentials by the Syrian and Libyan envoys and also in A.A. Gromyko's conversations with those countries' envoys were T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister.

#### Hails Libyan Role

LD291839 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1635 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 29 Apr (JANA)—Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, today received the brother secretary of the Arab Libyan People's Bureau in Moscow.

The Soviet president requested the brother secretary of the Arab Libyan People's Bureau to convey his greetings to the brother leader of the Revolution. He emphasized the strong and excellent relations existing between the two friendly Libyan and Soviet peoples.

During this audience, the Soviet president hailed the effective role played by the Great Jamahiriyah for the sake of achieving Arab unity.

#### Ivanov-Galitsyn Discusses Arab, Gulf Relations

JN291505 Kuwait AL-SIYASAH in Arabic  
26 Apr 88 p 19

[By Husayn Salamah]

[Text] Moscow—The first thing that attracts attention in the Soviet Union is that when they know a guest is coming from Kuwait, welcome signs naturally appear on their faces. They begin talking favorably about Kuwait, expressing admiration for its leaders and their wisdom in handling domestic and foreign policies.

In all fields where politics has entered the country of 250 million people, of whom there are no poor, you will find Soviet officials speaking highly of Kuwait. They are very interested in politics and realism. The first thing they say about Kuwait is that its leadership is realistic in handling the problems of the modern world.

In the Soviet Foreign Ministry, which occupies a huge and beautifully designed building, for which Moscow is known, AL-SIYASAH conducted a dialogue at the Arabian Gulf Department. The paper points out that the workers in this department are researchers in addition to being diplomats. They are all fluent in Arabic and fully knowledgeable of the Arabs past and present.

The dialogue was chaired by the chief of the department, Aleksandr Ivanov-Galitsyn. He began the dialogue with a brief account of the concerns and specializations of the Gulf department. The dialogue dealt with Soviet-Gulf relations. He stressed the importance and size of Kuwait's reputation in the Soviet Union, and the Soviets' respect for the wise policy of his royal highness the amir and for Kuwait's foreign policy, which is led by Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jabir, deputy prime minister and foreign minister. He said the Iraq-Iran war only benefits Israel.

On 'Arafat's visit, the Soviet official said agreement was reached on all points which the Soviet Union needs for its monthly meetings with the United States. Agreement was also reached on all attempts to divide the settlement in the Middle East or impose separate schemes. He stressed that the Soviet Union is seeking the establishment of a Palestinian state in the occupied West Bank and Gaza with the possibility of a confederation with Jordan or Syria after the establishment of the independent state. He added that the Soviet Union is not

opposed to the establishment of a secular state in all of Palestine where the Arabs and the Jews live together. The text of the dialogue follows:

The dialogue began on the specialization of the Soviet Foreign ministry's Gulf department. Mr Ivanov-Galitsyn said: In this department, we are chiefly concerned with thoroughly following developments in the Gulf area and continuing work to promote bilateral relations with its countries. In addition to Kuwait, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bahrain, Oman, and the UAE, which constitute the GCC, our responsibility also includes Jordan.

This department is in direct, constant contact with the Soviet embassies in most of these countries. The number of Soviet embassies in the Gulf has reached three, after having only one embassy in Kuwait. Two new embassies were opened in Oman and the UAE. Our ambassador in Muscat has not yet presented his credentials because of the advent of the blessed month of Ramadan.

All of the department's staff are specialists in Arab affairs. They have worked in the Gulf states and know the essence of things.

We follow the developments in the Gulf war on a continuous basis. We monitor Arab and Gulf relations with Iran. We are concerned with everything related to the dispute between Iraq and Iran, whether in the United Nations or in regional conferences, such as the Islamic conference. We monitor the policy of every state in the United Nations vis-a-vis the Gulf war.

In addition to all of this, we are concerned with studying and discussing relations with the GCC, and relations between the GCC and the EC.

[Salamah] How do you assess Kuwait-USSR relations after the passage of 25 years?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] Relations with Kuwait are excellent and there is full understanding between us. We respect the wise policy of the Kuwaiti amir, who formulates and steers Kuwait's foreign policy, and also Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jabir, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, who implements this policy with great skill. Kuwait has a good reputation in the USSR because we appreciate Kuwait's stand on international issues at the United Nations, its rational stand on the raging conflict in the Gulf, and its stand on the Middle East conflict. We describe these stands as remarkable.

[Salamah] When do you expect relations between the USSR and Saudi Arabia to be established?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] The establishment of official relations with Saudi Arabia depends on the Saudis. Therefore, we cannot set a date for this issue. However, political dialogue between us exists and is proceeding swiftly. We recently received Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud

al-Faysal. Later, an envoy of the Soviet leadership visited Riyadh. In general, we are satisfied with these relations. However, we believe it is necessary to establish official diplomatic relations because there is nothing that prevents their establishment, especially since our viewpoints are identical on several issues particularly the Iraq-Iran war, the Middle East crisis, the arms race, and other major international issues. We are undoubtedly interested in exchanging trade and scientists, and in participating in special studies in various current fields. I can say that nothing prevents a dialogue between us or the establishment of official relations in the future.

[Salamah] What are the limits of the Kuwaiti role in bringing Saudi-Soviet viewpoints in particular, and Soviet-Gulf viewpoints in general, close together?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] Kuwait plays a role in this regard. It has always supported the establishment of relations between the USSR and the Gulf states, particularly with Saudi Arabia.

[Salamah] Do you believe a settlement of the Afghan issue will help establish better relations between Moscow and the Gulf states, particularly Saudi Arabia?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] Yes. After settling the Afghan issue, things will change and the road will be paved for better dialogues. This is because a settlement of the Afghan issue will eliminate an important obstacle between the USSR and Saudi Arabia. We are now at the beginning of a new domestic stage. You can notice an open policy in all fields, particularly the promotion of democracy in our country, freedom of expression, and the revival of the news media, which is now full of various articles of interest to readers.

[Salamah] The USSR is a superpower and it has carried out great efforts in the field of tackling the volatile situation in the Gulf and in stopping the Iraq-Iran war. May we ask when will this war cease?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] In fact, we asked this question some time ago. We also listened to some Arab friends' opinions in this regard. I cannot give you a resolute answer because the issue of ending this war depends on the parties to the war, especially since the issuance of UN Security Council Resolution 598 calling for ending the war, the withdrawal of the two countries' forces to international borders, and the exchange of POW's. There were opinions and hopes in the USSR and in the world that this war would end soon because at the time we felt a positive change in the Iranian stand. For example, Iran expressed support for UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar's plan. For us, this meant Iranian approval of the UN Security Council. However, the Iranian government's true actions can no longer allow us to expect the war to end soon.

We are friends of Iraq and we are helping it to enhance its defense and to bolster and strengthen its economy. Despite this, we see some strict, inflexible stands in Iraq's behavior. Sometimes, Iraq's policy lacks flexibility. Finding a solution to the problem requires the exertion of joint efforts by the two parties to this problem, not by only one party. The Soviet Union is doing everything to reach a solution that brings about justice and helps realize the legitimate rights of the two parties. This solution must be based on a balance of interests. It cannot be based on the capitulation of one party to the other since this is impossible, due to the involvement of many parties in this war, such as the United States.

Hence, the solution must take into account the interests of all parties, foremost among which are Iraq and Iran. The new phase which followed the eruption of the war of the cities and the results of the endeavors of the UN secretary general have indicated that the two parties are ready to continue the dialogue. We believe the mere beginning of a dialogue is much better than the continuation of the war.

[Salamah] To what extent does the continuation of the Iraq-Iran war serve the interests of external powers?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] The United States has declared the Gulf region to be vital to its interests. Furthermore, it has deployed its forces in the region in an intensive manner. It has selfish ambitions pertaining to the imposition of hegemony on this region. It used the continuation of this war as a pretext to bring about its intervention in the region. The United States would not have had the chance to enter the Gulf if there had not been a war in the region. Therefore, the war was an excellent opportunity for it.

Besides, the embroilment of both Iraq and Iran in the war practically nullified their role as two Muslim states in contribution to the struggle against Israel, and prevented them from supporting the Palestinian cause. The United States supplies Iranian parties with weapons directly and indirectly.

[Salamah] Hasn't the Soviet stand changed on a resolution that would complement UN Security Council Resolution 598 regarding the imposition of punitive measures on the party which rejects the said resolution?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] We believe Resolution No. 598 constitutes a basis for concluding a settlement and ending the Gulf war because this resolution has its own vitality and contains all the points that serve the interests of the two parties without humiliating either party. It is a balanced resolution that reflects the desire of the entire international community. In addition, this resolution has won the unqualified support of all world states. Even Iran said that it is not against the resolution. Therefore, there is no need to change the formula of this resolution.

We still support it. We also support all the steps contained in it, including the UN secretary general's mission. To allow the UN secretary general to complete his mission, we proposed that a special envoy be appointed for Javier Perez de Cuellar and entrusted with holding daily talks with the two parties to the conflict, just like what happened in the Afghan-Pakistani negotiations, because the war needs daily efforts.

As for subsequent steps, some Western states—including the United States and the UK—and Iraq demanded that an international arms embargo resolution be issued against Iran. Our stand on this issue is to differ. Hence, an explanation is needed. We are not against the principle of accepting this resolution. It must also be understood that we are against the continuation of the war. Nay, we seek an end to this war as soon as possible. However, the Soviet Government has taken a stand on this issue. It must be understood that implementing an arms embargo resolution against Iran and naming Iran in that resolution will lead to an end to the dialogue with the Iranian Government. Hence, the Soviet Government believes that all possible steps must be taken to implement Resolution 598, the contents of which have not yet been exhausted. Hastening in this issue will lead to undesired results. Our representative to the UN Security Council is participating in the formulation of the new resolution. We are telling the Iranians that the issuance of subsequent steps to Resolution 598 will be a natural and necessary development if Iran does not accept this resolution. It must be understood that maintaining a dialogue with Iran is more important than continuing the war with it. Only through the maintenance of a dialogue with Iran can an end be secured to this war. I would also like to affirm that our UN Security Council representative has all of the authority he needs in this regard.

[Salamah] How do you view the GCC, and how effective a role can its member-states play in containing the war?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] It is natural that the Gulf states should try to unite. Small states would be better off when combined in a larger entity, particularly since the Gulf states have social and political systems and a historical heritage in common. Therefore, it is not surprising that the GCC came into existence. We view the grouping not so much as a military bloc as an economic and political community, with which we are prepared to talk and coordinate moves for bringing the war to an end. In any case, I don't think the GCC has enough of an influence to prevent the spread of the war. We are aware of the fact that the GCC is keeping its lines of communication open with Iran and that the UAE has been charged with as much by the Council. We have also been trying to talk the Iranians into heeding the voice of reason. In our view, the UAE efforts are similar to ours. We appreciate the economic and political weight of this Gulf grouping. When the GCC first came into existence, we had some apprehensions. Our fears stemmed from U.S. efforts to rally Islamic countries around the slogan of combating



communism—a pretext routinely used by the United States to win over friends against the Soviet Union. However, the GCC image has changed and we now understand why the entity was created. We maintain a presence in the Arabian peninsula and appreciate all the facts. The Soviet Union welcomes the coming together of countries with similar roots. We have welcomed all Arab attempts at unity from the Syrian-Egyptian union in the Jamal 'Abd al-Nasir era to the merger between Egypt and Libya.

[Salamah] What do you think of Egypt's role in the Mideast?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] Mubarak's Egypt is different from Al-Sadat's Egypt. Egypt's domestic policy is now more independent. Al-Sadat had an ideology based on an alliance with Israel and the United States. He was prepared to play a role identical to that of Israel vis-a-vis the United States. However, President Mubarak has changed the picture completely and said he is with the Arabs. Mubarak is patriotic and Arab. He has called for balanced relations with the United States and the USSR. Al-Sadat encouraged open consumer policies. As for the Camp David accords and Mubarak's stand regarding them, the agreements are made up of two parts: first, Egypt's commitments to Israel, which still stand, and second, the section of the Palestine question which Egypt feels is no longer relevant. Egypt is prepared to participate in a solution to the Palestinian problem, and supports Palestinian self-determination.

[Salamah] The resolution of any regional or international dispute must out of necessity involve the USSR. Where do you stand on the establishment of a Palestinian state?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] The Soviet Union is the only country in the world that keeps recalling UN Partition Resolution 181. When PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat was in Moscow, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze declared that the USSR supports Palestinian self-determination. General Secretary Gorbachev told 'Arafat that self-determination is a key plank of Soviet Mideast policy.

[Salamah] Did the talks during the visit touch on the issue of a Palestinian state?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] It was the first time the Soviet leadership did not discuss a Palestinian state. This is not a rescindment of the Soviet stand, but we believe some flexibility should exist.

During the PNC session, the Palestinians themselves said they support a confederation with Jordan. They themselves are trying to find a solution.

[Salamah] If a state means the West Bank and Gaza, can a settlement in the Middle East be viewed as just and lasting knowing that millions of Palestinians who were expelled in 1948 are living in camps around Palestine and still hold keys to their houses in Palestine?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] We, as realistic politicians, can only discuss the establishment of a state in the West Bank and Gaza. Palestinians living abroad can return to this state. Israel is a fait accompli. Talking about the repatriation of the 1948 Palestinians is something extreme.

[Salamah] The Arabs possess huge economic and natural resources. The Arab world is densely populated and its geographic depth is extremely wide. The Arabs, like other peoples, will inevitably possess technology. The balance of power will then change. Will the Soviet Union then object to a new fait accompli based on the destruction of the Zionist entity and the establishment of a secular democratic state where Arabs and Jews live together?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] The Soviet Union is not opposed to this. We were the first country in the world to call in the United Nations for the establishment of a secular state in Palestine. Specifically, Gromyko was the one who presented this proposal when he was the Soviet UN representative.

[Salamah] What are the undeclared results of 'Arafat's visit to Moscow?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] Our policy is now open. We do not have things to hide. Everything Gorbachev told 'Arafat was published in the media. As an assessment of the outcome of the visit, I can tell you that we were very interested in the visit. It was the first official visit by a Palestinian leader since 1983. There were some obscure aspects in Palestinian-Soviet relations due to the difficult stage after the Beirut events and the Amman accord.

During the visit, Gorbachev eliminated all obscurities. We are now in full agreement with the Palestinians. We agreed to continue joint efforts. The explanation of the Palestinian position will help us in the monthly dialogue with the United States on the Middle East. This dialogue is conducted at the foreign ministerial level. It was difficult for us to conduct and continue this dialogue without knowing the Palestinian position.

We agreed with the Palestinians to activate efforts to convene an international conference and to foil all attempts to divide the settlement or impose separate schemes on the Arabs.

On the other hand, the visit helped support the Palestinian stand because the Soviet Union supports the Palestinian issue and the uprising in the occupied Arab territories.

[Salamah] What about the effect of the visit on Palestinian-Syrian relations?

[Ivanov-Galitsyn] It is difficult to discuss the effect only 2 weeks after the visit. But we always encourage the achievement of a Palestinian-Syrian coordination. The same thing goes for Jordan, taking into consideration Palestinian interests. We think it is hard for Jordan to face Israeli and U.S. plans alone; this emphasizes the role of Jordan which has special relations with the United States. However, without Palestinian participation, Jordan can never achieve a full perspective toward the Middle East. That is why we supported the idea of a joint Arab delegation.

**Journalists Meet With PLO Leaders in Tunis**  
LD300426 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Tunis April 29 TASS—Members of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, Faruq Qaddumi and Muhammad 'Abbas, received here today a delegation of the Union of Journalists of the Soviet Union, led by Oleg Fomin, members of the Presidium of the Board of the Soviet Committee on Friendship and Solidarity with the Arab People of Palestine. The delegation is staying here at the invitation of the Union of Palestine Writers (?and) Journalists.

During a friendly conversation the sides discussed ways of using the mass media to enlist wide public support for the struggle of the Palestine people against Israeli occupation troops, for the exercise of their inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination and their own state.

The Palestine leaders highly assessed the role of the Soviet public in rendering all-round support to the just cause of the Palestine people.

**Libya Denounces NATO Mediterranean Exercises**  
LD011340 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT  
1 May 88

[Text] Tripoli May 1 TASS—The NATO's military exercises in the Mediterranean create a direct threat to the security, independence and sovereignty of the countries of the region. They are fraught with the most unpredictable consequences. The exercises testify to provocative intentions of the parties to the exercises vis-a-vis the Mediterranean peoples which want to live in peace and tranquility.

This is said in a statement of the General People's Committee for Foreign Liaison of Libya, which has been distributed by the JANA news agency. The Libyan Jamahiriyyah denounces the NATO exercises and calls upon the Mediterranean peoples and the whole of the world public to raise the voice of protest against the exercises, the statement underlines.

**U.S. 'Intervention' in Gulf Condemned**  
NC2904172888 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress  
in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 28 Apr 88

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] The Iranian permanent representative to the United Nations, Mohammad Ja'far Mahallati, has accused the United States of violating UN Security Council Resolution 598. He stressed that the hail of fire on Iranian oil platforms in the Persian Gulf by U.S. warships was a brazen provocation in violation of Clause 5 of the resolution, which stipulates that all governments should refrain from actions which may lead to an escalation of tension in the region.

In fact, the U.S. repressive measure was unjustified, whatever the excuse, and opposes UN efforts to terminate the Iran-Iraq conflict and improve the situation in the Persian Gulf. This (?action) is considered tantamount to direct U.S. intervention in the Iran-Iraq war, to Iraq's benefit.

The history of the conflict also reminds us of a different kind of U.S. intervention: Washington's clandestine actions exposed during the Irangate scam. As you know, those operations were aimed at transforming Iran into a tool of U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf. Was it not the United States that supplied classified information on economic and military centers in Iran and Iraq to Tehran and Baghdad? These centers later became the targets of bombing and missile attacks by both parties. [passage omitted]

The UN Security Council resolution adopted in July last year opened the way for an honorable cease-fire between Tehran and Baghdad. (?The course of) events indicates that neither of the two warring sides is capable of attaining victory. Iranian forces are greater in number, while the Iraqis are better equipped with arms and have a strong Air Force. It appears that the impasse on the battlefronts which has continued for the past few years is in itself a sign that the only path out of this impasse is the political one. However, no progress has been achieved in this regard. Iraq accepted the UN resolution, but Iran's response was ambiguous. Iran does not reject the resolution basically, but it has imposed a series of conditions, including the declaring of its adversary as the aggressor.

If these conditions were accepted, would peace be established? In our opinion, this is not the correct (?manner of) presenting the problem. Every resolution, every guarantee, is part of a chain of (?solutions), talks, and lengthy consultations. Every kind of change brings a complete (?series) of repercussions. Nor is this the main consideration. We should keep in mind that a clash between two rivals is taking place in the Persian Gulf. In addition, according to observers, Iran's intransigence stems mostly from its internal situation. [passage omitted]

In any case, the war continues, and UN Security Council Resolution 598 has not been implemented. If one party only notes the violation of the resolution by the other but makes no commitment for its implementation, there will be no way of extricating anyone from this impasse. Such is the course of action followed by Tehran and Washington.

**Iranian Tudeh Party Publishes May Day Appeals**  
*NC3004090788 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress  
in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 29 Apr 88*

[Text] On the eve of May Day, the day of solidarity between the workers of the world, NAMEH-YE MARDOM has published appeals to workers which reflect the basic aspects of the domestic and foreign policies of the Tudeh Party of Iran.

The Tudeh Party of Iran calls on the workers and toilers to rise up for democratic changes, to defend the lives of the political prisoners, to extend all-embracing assistance to the families of these prisoners, and to struggle more actively against the closing down of establishments, against the general and extensive firing of workers, and against child labor.

The Tudeh Party of Iran wants the war and fratricide between Iran and Iraq to end on the basis of Security Council Resolution 598. The Tudeh Party appeals point out that the Iranian nation is supported by all peace-loving and progressive forces in the world in its struggles to end the bloodshed. Now, more than ever before, Iranians need peace and calm. Instead of buying more and more arms, provisions should be made for work, food, and housing.

The Tudeh Party of Iran points out that only the forces of reaction and world imperialism, first and foremost the United States, reap benefits from the continuation of the war.

**Agreement To Help Modernize Egyptian Plant**  
*PM291249 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA  
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 28 Apr 88 p 3*

[TASS correspondent V. Yefremov dispatch: "Unique Contract"]

[Text] Cairo, 27 Apr—A contract between the Egyptian national "Egypalum" Company and the "Tsvetmetpromeksport" Foreign Trade Association on cooperation between Soviet and Egyptian organizations in the sphere of introducing new progressive technology at the Naj Hammadi Aluminum Production Plant, which was constructed with Soviet aid, was signed here on Tuesday. The contract provides for organizing an experimental area at the plant for creating electrolytic cells using calcined [obozhzhennyye] anodes. The introduction of new technology will make it possible to boost productivity at this large complex, increase output production by 20-25 percent, and also considerably save on electricity.

Speaking at the document signing ceremony, Egyptian Industry Minister M. 'Abd al-Wahhab stressed that this contract—unique in Egypt at present—is of great importance since it envisages joint participation by Egyptian and Soviet engineers and specialists in elaborating and introducing new technology for Egyptian national industry. The implementation of these projects matches the interests of the country's socioeconomic development. The minister noted the Soviet Union's great contribution to boosting Egypt's national economy and expressed interest in expanding and galvanizing mutually advantageous relations between the two countries.

**Briefs**

**Health Agreement With Afghanistan**

An agreement has been signed in Kabul on cooperation between the Central Institute of Traumatology and Orthopedics of the USSR Ministry of Health and the newly formed Afghan Institute of Traumatology, Orthopedics, and Prosthesis. The two institutes will engage in joint research work and exchange specialists. [Summary] [LD302342 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0430 GMT 30 Apr 88]

**East Europe**

**PPR Strikes Designed To Raise May Day Tension**  
*PM291227 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 88  
Morning Edition p 5*

[Dispatch by own correspondent L. Toporkov under the "Apt Remarks" rubric: "Old Scenario"]

[Text] Warsaw—As May Day approaches forces in People's Poland hostile to socialism generally begin to step up their provocative activity.

This time they have chosen the economic reform and the regulation of labor remuneration and prices connected with it as the target of their attacks. Prices for goods and services have recently risen substantially, but at enterprises wages have risen even more. This, as the Polish Government press representative observed at a news conference, is bound to cause alarm, since the increase in wages is outstripping growth in the production of material goods. This is a phenomenon conducive to inflationary processes. The reform, however, is designed to create balance in the labor, goods, and services market.

What, then, are those who dislike the reform and the policy of socialist renewal in Poland doing? Playing on the quite natural emotions of people discontented at the price rises, they are inciting them to every kind of protest, particularly strikes.

On Tuesday, so PAP has reported, strikes were organized in a number of shops in the Nowa Huta steelworks. They have demanded a wage increase there which is beyond the enterprise's financial means. Poland has already, as



the agency comments, experienced the consequences of such actions in the past, when excessive payments made as a result of strikes disorganized the country's economy.

The instigators of the strike are cynically playing on working people's feelings and deliberately misleading them. It is claimed that a forced increase in earnings will improve people's material situation. This is particularly harmful under the economic reform, since it undermines its efficiency and consequently the population's living standards.

Those who organized the strike have deliberately breached the legal norms, which provide for the use of this extreme form of workers' protest only when all potential for negotiation has been exhausted. They have thereby shown that the most important thing for them is not to improve workers' material position but to heighten tension prior to May Day.

The Nowa Huta steel works is, unfortunately, no exception. A 12-hour strike had been called in Bydgoszcz and neighboring Inowroclaw a little earlier. The demand was the same—increased wages. Regardless of who pays.

The Western mass media are trying to use all these incidents clearly inspired by others for propaganda ends to tarnish the good name of People's Poland. They are intent on exacerbating the situation in the country and causing the reform to fail. The not-unknown Lech Walesa, in Warsaw for a meeting with an eminent foreign visitor, made the usual provocative statements in conversation with Western correspondents. Tension is growing in Poland and "anything is possible." J. Rulewski, a no less odious figure from the world of the open "underground," was about to worm his way into the Bydgoszcz transport workers' ranks when, to their credit, they refused the services of this inveterate extremist.

Commenting on the events connected with the strikes, TRYBUNA LUDU writes that their organizers have embarked on their ventures when the extensive democratization of all spheres of life is being carried out, law and order are strengthening, and other changes for the better are apparent. Of course, life is still hard for many people in present-day Poland. That is why everything now depends not on rash demands but on well-organized labor. The principles of the second phase of economic reform are creating all the conditions necessary for increased earnings, but in accordance with the laws of economics and not despite them. It is wrong to demand increased wages from one's enterprise irrespective of its production achievements. Otherwise, the paper stresses, we could find ourselves on the slippery slope to anarchy.

#### West Finds 'Pretext' in Strikes

LD301649 Moscow Television Service in Russian  
1430 GMT 30 Apr 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by political observer Igor Kudrin]

[Excerpts] [Kudrin] Hello there, comrades. The holiday of international solidarity of working people is on the way. [passage omitted] How is May Day being marked by our friends in the countries of socialism? Not long before the program, I spoke to our correspondents in Poland and Hungary. The first to come on the line was Vladimir Beletskiy in Warsaw:

[Belitskiy] [Passage omitted on route of May Day march and the current economic situation]

[Kudrin] The Western news media are currently making a lot of fuss about incidents at individual Polish enterprises. What is going on, Vladimir?

[Beletskiy] Forces in the West that are hostile to Poland constantly find one pretext or another to whip up the latest propaganda ballyhoo. With regard to the strike at a number of shops of the Nowa Huta metallurgical combine, a whole series of demands for a substantial pay increase has been put forward there. At the same time, experts are stressing that, considering the difficult economic situation in the country and the position at the combine itself, these demands are not justified. There is another important point, however. The strike itself runs counter to Polish law. Polish law provides for the right to strike, but only when all other methods for settling the conflict through negotiation have been exhausted. In the present very difficult circumstances the party is stressing the need for implementing reforms consistently and decisively, and they can only be brought in through the common efforts and joint action of all Poles in a spirit of national accord.

#### Jakes' May Day Speech Stresses Cooperation

LD011346 Moscow TASS in English 1321 GMT  
1 May 88

[Text] Prague May 1 TASS—We will never forget that the Soviet people and their valiant army brought freedom to Czechoslovakia in May 1945 at the cost of enormous human casualties, Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee, said in his address to the May Day demonstration in Prague today. We will always keep and develop the fraternity, alliance and cooperation with the USSR.

A comprehensive programme to reshape and democratize society, which enjoys the support of the majority of the country's citizens, is in progress in Czechoslovakia now on the initiative and under the guidance of the Communist Party. But the goals set can be achieved only in conditions of peace. Therefore, at one with millions of people on earth Czechoslovakia focuses efforts on removing the threat of a nuclear war and ensuring peaceful future.

The peaceful foreign policy by the USSR and other socialist countries, in whose implementation Czechoslovakia takes a vigorous part, points up the way towards resolving urgent international problems, the Czechoslovak leader said.

**Vorotnikov Montenegro Trip Stresses Direct Ties**  
*PM290855 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 4*

[TASS reports under general heading: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Excerpt] Belgrade, 27 Apr.—[Passage omitted] At the invitation of the Executive Council of the Montenegro Socialist Republic Assembly V.I. Vorotnikov visited Titograd today. He was met at the airport by V. Vukadinovic, chairman of the Montenegro Assembly Executive Council and S. Sekaric, secretary of the Montenegro League of Communists Central Committee Presidium.

On the same day official talks began between V.I. Vorotnikov and V. Vukadinovic.

The parties stressed that the meeting was taking place at a period of intensive development in Soviet-Yugoslav relations and vigorously strengthening friendship and trust between the peoples of both countries, which was given a fresh impetus by M.S. Gorbachev's recent visit to the SFRY.

During the talks great attention was given to the state of and prospects for friendly ties between the RSFSR and Montenegro within the framework of Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation.

V.I. Vorotnikov stressed that powerful momentum will be given to the transformation process in the USSR by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, which will generalize the accumulated experience of restructuring and discuss the pressing problems involved in improving the political system and strengthening the role of the soviets of people's deputies.

Talking about topical and prospective tasks facing the working people of Montenegro and the republic party organization, V. Vukadinovic noted that the basic efforts of the party and society are concentrated on improving the economic and political system and overcoming obstacles which are impeding progress in the country and the republic.

Today V.I. Vorotnikov conducted talks with M. Radovic, chairman of the Montenegro League of Communists Central Committee Presidium.

A broad exchange of opinions on questions of cooperation between the RSFSR and Montenegro took place. It was noted that the Soviet-Yugoslav declaration, the Long-Term Program for the Development of Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation Between the

USSR and the SFRY Through the Year 2000, and other accords reached during the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's visit to the SFRY are creating all the necessary prerequisites for essential progress in all areas of USSR-SFRY relations and, within their framework, direct friendly relations between the RSFSR and Montenegro. The main task is to jointly and to persistently expand direct ties between enterprises in the two republics, including ties based on cooperation, specialization, and joint capital investments, and to develop different forms for contacts among working people, contacts between working collectives, their party, trade union, and youth organizations, and business ties in the sphere of culture, science, education and tourism.

V.F. Maltsev, USSR ambassador to the SFRY, took part in the talks and meetings.

V. Vukadinovic gave a dinner in honor of V.I. Vorotnikov.

**Berlin River Border Patrol Described**  
*PM281359 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Apr 88*  
*Morning Edition p 1, 5*

[Own Correspondent V. Lapskiy "On-the-Spot Report": "With Border Guards on the Spree"]

[Text] Berlin—The border patrol launch left its mooring, quickly turned around, and set off down the River Spree, leaving behind it an iridescent wake.

There are five people aboard the patrol boat: Three crew members, Lieutenant Colonel Rainer Menzel of the GDR border troops, and your IZVESTIYA correspondent. The border guards are armed. For them this trip is both ordinary and extraordinary. They are carrying out an official patrol of the border and for the first time there is also a foreign visitor aboard the launch commanded by Senior Lieutenant Rolf Kindler. Two "uninhabited" islands—Kratubrich and Liebesinsel—are left behind to starboard. The launch passes Straelau and speeds alongside the ever-beautiful Treptow Park.

GDR territory is still visible to both sides of the boat, and Lt Col Menzel talks about his border. It is named for General Berzarin, the first Soviet commander of Berlin. The section of the border entrusted to the unit is far from easy and runs north-south through the center of the capital. The launch passes beneath the Eisenbruecke. The West German bank is already in view. The backs of the buildings facing the GDR side look as though they have not been repaired since the war. The walls are cracked and in places are crumbling.

"Do you often get acts of provocation from that bank?" I asked Lt Col Menzel.

"It does happen, but much more in the past than now."

The embankment wall of the West German bank is covered with black graffiti insulting the GDR. The inscriptions are old ones.

"As you can see," the lieutenant colonel said, "no one is going to scrub them off or paint them over. Hooligans on the West German bank often shout threats at the border guards and throw rocks or bottles. Sometimes they also fire rubber bullets and air guns. The border guards invariably show restraint and composure and do not yield to the provocation."

The lieutenant colonel pointed to a red-and-white striped column. This is an alarm post for use in the event of an emergency.

"For example, a man falls into the water," my interlocutor explained. "The column is switched on, emitting an audible and visible alarm signal. But sometimes this alarm is abused. It is switched on for no good reason. Serious acts of provocation have occurred in the past."

While the lieutenant colonel and I were talking, the launch commander was scanning the water and the West German bank attentively. People were strolling along the embankment, children were fishing, and inquisitive passers-by were watching the launch. All seemed calm.

Yes, things became calmer recently on this unusual border in the center of GDR territory. The republic's government has contributed much to that. Quite recently Comrade Erich Honecker received Eberhard Diepgen, ruling mayor of West Berlin. Their views coincided on a large number of key international problems, including the significance of the four-power agreement on West Berlin, which must continue to be strictly observed and accepted in its entirety.

They agreed on some specific questions concerning mutual relations between the GDR and West Berlin: trade, transport links, the development of contacts between local government organs, and the improvement of conditions for single visits by West Berliners to the GDR capital.

These are the concrete products of the normalization of relations. Until comparatively recently regarded as a "front line city," West Berlin has now begun to evaluate far more realistically than before the policy of good-neighborliness and cooperation pursued by the GDR. The situation on the border has also changed for the better although it is too early to speak of full normalization. Neo-nazis and political hooligans of various hues there still like to test the GDR border guards' nerves.

The launch continued for about 2 km and turned back. Further on the border continues on land. Another border patrol boat approached. The patrolling of the Spree continues uninterrupted.

Our launch pulls into its mooring. The commander reports: "No incidents, the border is quiet."

**MSZMP Holds Conference on Politics, Glasnost**  
*PM281523 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 5*

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch under the "News From Socialist Countries" rubric: "Politics and Glasnost"]

[Text] Budapest, 26 Apr—A conference on the topic "Politics and Glasnost" has been organized by the MSZMP Central Committee Agitation and Propaganda Department. It discussed questions concerned with information and the further democratization of the life of society in light of preparation for the all-Hungary party conference.

Some 200 representatives of the mass media, social scientists, political scientists, and party workers noted during plenary sessions and sectional meetings that increasing glasnost forms an integral part of the upcoming reform of political institutions. The country is at a stage of development where revolutionary tasks have to be solved, and this needs effective and constructive criticism of shortcomings and monitoring of the implementation of the planned programs by the mass media.

We need the kind of glasnost, speakers stressed, which works for the good of socialism and strengthens the leading role of the party and trust between it and the masses. It is important that the press and radio and television broadcasts convey the opinion of all strata of society and the mood of working people.

## West Europe

**Soviet Businessman Expelled as Industrial Spy**  
*LD301024 Stockholm International Service*  
*in Swedish 1000 GMT 30 Apr 88*

[Text] A Soviet businessman has been expelled from Sweden accused of industrial espionage. Both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Swedish National Police Board are very reticent on more details of circumstances concerning the activities of the Soviet businessman. The only information given is that he has tried to acquire information on Swedish and foreign technology and industry.

It is not believed that he has been able to harm Swedish interests. The Soviet businessman operated in Gothenburg.



**Soviet, British Customs Officers Seize Drugs**  
*LD291238 Moscow TASS in English 1217 GMT  
29 Apr 88*

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Three and a half tons of hashish with a street value of more than ten million pounds sterling have been seized from an international drug trafficking ring in a joint operation pulled off by the Soviet and British customs services.

Five of the criminals involved in the racket have been arrested and efforts to track down their accomplices are continuing.

A report to this effect came to the Main Customs Administration under the Soviet Government from the Royal Customs Service in London as part of reciprocal exchanges of information and interaction to combat drug trafficking in keeping with a memorandum of understanding signed in Moscow last February by the Soviet and British foreign ministers.

The operation, which began at Moscow's central customs, was successfully concluded at the British port of Tilbury.

The report on Soviet-British cooperation to fight the kinds of contraband that represent a particularly great social danger developing and growing closer was received with satisfaction at the Main Customs Administration.

TASS commentator Viktor Ponomarev writes in this connection:

The contraband drugs were found in 400 bags with liquorice, which were travelling in two containers in transit through Soviet territory from Afghanistan to be shipped to Tilbury from Leningrad.

Judging by various indications discovered during a preliminary investigation in Moscow, the contraband was produced in Pakistan.

Notified by the Soviet side, the British service's investigators arrived in Moscow. A plan for a joint operation codenamed "Diplomat" was hammered out here.

The cargo, monitored by customs agents, proceeded on board the Baltic Osprey ship to the British port where it was secretly removed from the containers.

With British customs officers continuing the watch on it, the cargo was brought by the consignee to an industrial warehouse at an abandoned U.S. air base in Burtonwood, Warrington. There, however, the criminal venture was busted.

Richard Lawrence, head of the Royal Customs Service's Investigation Department, said that it was the first instance of Soviet-British cooperation in the field and that Soviet colleagues had been helpful from the very beginning.

He added that drug smuggling was an international problem and that organized crime could only be overpowered by good and effective cooperation among law enforcement agencies.

Operation Diplomat is another example of broadening international cooperation in combatting the drug trafficking problem.

It has followed a successful Soviet-Canadian operation which has smashed one of the rings of the international mafia attempting to exploit transit routes through the USSR to smuggle narcotics to Western Europe and the Americas.

The experience of joint efforts to grapple with a danger threatening the entire world community demonstrates that there is no other way.

It is with this awareness that talks are currently under way at government level on Soviet customs' cooperation with France and the United States.

Soviet customs officials are continuing working contacts with colleagues in Norway, Sweden and Holland. The Main Customs Administration is stepping up its participation in the Customs Cooperation Council.

The need for joint action against the international drug mafia is increasingly realized by our foreign partners, with corresponding practical moves ensuing.

**Britain's Howe Receives Adamishin in London**  
*LD282126 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT  
28 Apr 88*

[Text] London April 28 TASS—Geoffrey Howe, Britain's secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, today received special representative of the Soviet leadership Anatoliy Adamishin.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister explained in detail Soviet position in connection with the signing of the Geneva accords on the political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. It was stressed that they opened up prospects for establishing peace on Afghan soil, while the need was stressed for all countries to promote the nascent positive processes. In that context, the position of Britain was singled out as a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council.

The British secretary described the political decision of the USSR to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan as wise, urged all countries to observe the Geneva accords

and noted that Britain was attaching paramount significance to the problem of refugees return. It was confirmed that on some issues discussed, there remained differences in approaches.

The conversation, which passed in a business-like and constructive atmosphere, was attended by Soviet Ambassador to Britain Leonid Zamyatin.

**Gromyko Receives Swiss Interior Minister**  
*PM011325 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 6*

[TASS report: "Conversation in the Kremlin"]

[Text] A.A. Gromyko received on 28 April in the Kremlin Flavio Cotti, member of the Federal Assembly (government) and chief of the Swiss Federal Department (minister) of the Interior, who is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR minister of culture. Switzerland's state administrative organs are unusual in that each department has quite broad competence. For instance, the Department of the Interior, apart from safeguarding public order and monitoring law observance, also tackles questions of culture, the health service, social security, environmental protection, education, and science.

Thus F. Cotti has come to the Soviet Union for the opening of an exhibition by the Swiss artist Ferdinand Hodler. The guest began his conversation with the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium by talking about his impressions of the exhibition, which has been organized at the A.S. Pushkin State Art Museum, and the great deal that Soviet cultural workers have done to organize this exhibition.

Then the interlocutors discussed the present state of Soviet-Swiss relations. F. Cotti said that Switzerland is contributing to the achievement of accords between the two powers—the USSR and the United States. It was on Swiss territory that the meeting between the USSR and U.S. foreign ministers took place recently and Geneva was literally the other day the place where important agreements were signed settling the situation around Afghanistan.

A.A. Gromyko remarked that Switzerland holds a reliable place in the system of international relations because a number of international organizations have their headquarters in that country and the Swiss state creates conditions to develop the trend of easing tension in relations between countries.

In the course of the conversation bilateral relations in the cultural sphere were examined. F. Cotti talked about the upcoming exhibition of Soviet painters in Bern, the planned exhibition of young Moscow artists in Basel, and the great Soviet art festival in Zurich—the largest of

the planned events in Switzerland's cultural life. Whereas last year the French festival was the largest cultural event in Switzerland, this year it will be the Soviet Union's festival.

Nevertheless, as the Soviet side noted, full use has not been made of the potential for developing our relations. In particular, it is well known that Swiss output is of high quality. We would like cultural ties to develop, but not at the cost of paying less attention to economic cooperation. F. Cotti agreed with this viewpoint.

A.A. Gromyko said that Soviet-Swiss ties are timid in terms of human contacts. The Swiss can indeed offer Soviet people tours through the highlands and lowlands in their country, that is, the splendors of the Alps. Likewise, the Swiss can tour the highlands and lowlands of the Soviet Union. So we can send parliamentary and governmental representatives, public delegations, and groups of citizens to each other's countries much more often, notably through tourism.

At the visitor's request, the Soviet side talked about restructuring in our country. The policy of transformations in all spheres of economic, cultural, and scientific life has become an objective reality for Soviet people. They are confident that the tasks set by the party will be fulfilled.

F. Cotti noted that the present successes in the Soviet Union are arousing delight among the Swiss, who fully agree with the aims of this policy.

A.A. Gromyko stressed that owing to restructuring, new possibilities are also opening up for boosting Soviet-Swiss relations to a higher qualitative level. He drew his guest's attention to the fact that, as M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has frequently stressed, the restructuring of internal life will undoubtedly also have a positive effect on the development of international relations. When examining practical questions of cooperation between the USSR and Switzerland the sides expressed readiness to actively seek out new forms and ways of improving and expanding ties in the sphere of the economy, culture, science, and technology.

The conversation took place in a frank and friendly atmosphere.

V.I. Kazenin, USSR deputy minister of culture, and Francis Pianca, Swiss ambassador to the USSR, were present during the conversation.

**More on USSR-FRG Forum on European Security**

**Tolkunov, Zagladin Speak**  
*PM291549 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in*  
*Russian 29 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "In the Name of Stability"]

[Text] A frank, businesslike exchange of opinions on a broad range of questions linked with the all-European process began on 28 April in Moscow between the

representatives of the Soviet and FRG public. The traditional meeting on the theme of "Stability in Europe" was organized by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and the Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FRG). For the first time, the world is embarking on real disarmament: The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has been signed, L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, stressed on opening the meeting. The breakthrough here has created a new psychological situation in Europe—expectations of further steps toward disarmament and the confidence that disarmament is attainable and practicable. There are, unfortunately, still many politicians in the West who are unclear as to how to achieve disarmament and stability on the continent, nor is there unity on this question among Western countries either. The speaker stressed that the FRG, in whose policy on the nuclear question reassuring changes can be detected, plays a great role in determining precise guidelines.

Stability on the continent does not mean stagnation, V.V. Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, stressed: It means the constant development of the all-European process, which is oriented toward peace, security, and mutually advantageous cooperation. In talking about stability, we rely on definite principles reflected in CPSU documents. The first of these is the unconditional recognition of the diversity of our continent's countries and a positively tolerant attitude to that diversity. It is a reality that states belonging to different sociopolitical systems exist on European territory. We are firmly convinced that stability on the continent cannot be ensured unless recognition of this fact is guaranteed not only in words but also in deed.

#### **Dobrynin Meets With Group**

LD292220 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Vadim Zagladin, first deputy head of the CPSU CC International Department, received today representatives of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), here for a conference of Soviet and West German public, "Stability in Europe".

The conference was sponsored by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and West Germany's Friedrich Ebert Foundation.

The West German delegation included Egon Bahr, a member of the SPD Presidium, and Bundestag Deputies Andreas von Buelow, Karsten Voigt, Katrin Fuchs, Erwin Horn, Gernot Erler and Horst Jungmann.

An exchange of opinion on a broad range of questions was held. First of all, both sides dwelt on ways to ensure European security following the signing of the INF treaty.

The West German participants were genuinely interested in the progress in and prospects of the Soviet-U.S. talks on cuts in strategic offensive weapons in the close connection with compliance with the ABM treaty.

Another topic was the military balance of forces in Europe, cuts in conventional forces and armaments, transition to concepts of reasonable sufficiency, non-offensive defence.

In this connection, the Soviet side clearly stated that the USSR was ready not only for a full exchange of relevant data regarding the sides' armed forces, but also for early practical talks on their considerable reduction, provided the present asymmetries were eliminated.

Under these conditions, the Soviet Union would be ready for the broadest control measures.

Taking into account the deepening process of integration in Western and Eastern Europe, the sides also exchanged opinions on the subject.

Summing up the results of the conference, the participants agreed that such contacts were fruitful and it would be expedient to continue and develop them in future.

#### **FRG's Genscher Criticizes NATO Nuclear Policy**

LD302153 Moscow TASS in English 2047 GMT  
30 Apr 88

[Text] Bonn April 30 TASS—West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher today spoke at a congress of the Bavarian Organisation of the Free Democratic Party (FDP). He criticized the NATO plans regarding modernization of nuclear weapons in Western Europe. The advocates of nuclear modernization should realize that at issue today is, first and foremost, modernization of thinking in our world.

The minister noted that Soviet-U.S. negotiations on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments had good chances for success. He said the efforts to cut conventional armaments were also of major importance.

Genscher declared for developing new forms of East-West cooperation, including in the field of the economy and trade. The USSR's policy provides favourable chances for this, which should be used, he stressed.



**FRG's Von Buelow Interviewed on Disarmament**  
*LD301907 Moscow TASS in English 1801 GMT*  
30 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS—We can state today that virtually in all areas concerning the disarmament policy and the future of Europe the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) and our Soviet partners in the talks are on one line, Dr Andreas von Buelow, a West German expert on disarmament issues, deputy of the Bundestag and one of the SPD leading politicians, said in an interview with the newspaper IZVESTIYA today. He attended a regular meeting of representatives of the Soviet and West German public on the subject "stability in Europe" that drew to an end here Friday.

There is consensus between us that either side intends to build defence only in its own territory, not to intrude under the pretext of the interests of defence into other countries' territory, the MP said. We hold a uniform view that the offensive structures should be eliminated, that such a state be reached when either side will be confident of its capacity reliably to defend its state.

Such notions are still alien to a considerable part of the NATO members. We have to exert a good deal of efforts to get our concept accepted in the West. I consider this direction as highly sensible, it lays down the foundation under a common European edifice. The Soviet side unreservedly supports us in this.

Asked what new elements the Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles introduced in the European policy, Von Buelow replied that this treaty created a precedent for a possible breakthrough in the field of nuclear disarmament and this alone was valuable. The process of moulding the European public opinion in this field progressed conspicuously—primarily due to the new Soviet policy, the conclusive proposals coming from the USSR. The new thinking has evolved in our country as well as in other West European countries, especially in non-nuclear ones, and a new policy can be built on this, the expert stressed.

Commenting on the outcome of the Moscow meeting, Von Buelow said, in part, that it was a major stage in building up confidence. The information on the Soviet side's proposal to the United States for exchanging extensive military data in developing a verification mechanism shortly evoked strong interest among West German participants in the forum. This would spur a fast movement ahead in the disarmament field, the West German parliamentarian emphasized.

**FRG Bundesrat Approves INF Monitoring Accord**  
*LD292045 Moscow TASS in English 2000 GMT*  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Bonn April 29 TASS—The West German Bundesrat (federal council) approved today a draft agreement on monitoring compliance with the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty.

The draft had earlier been approved by the Bundestag (federal assembly).

The agreement is to be signed by the United States, West Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands.

**Multisector Enterprise Formed With FRG Firm**  
*PM011849 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 88*  
Second Edition p 3

[T. Yurina report: "Birth of 'Fazis SP.' Reportage From the International Trade Center"]

[Text] A news conference was held yesterday in the Moscow International Trade Center devoted to the creation of a new Soviet-FRG joint enterprise. Its name is "Fazis SP." It is the first joint enterprise in the USSR set up on the regional principle rather than the sector principle.

Fazis is the ancient name of the Georgian city of Poti. A territorial intersector association has been operating here since 1982 involving a number of industrial, transport, and trade enterprises. Poti has a large port, as a result of which the city is called the maritime gateway of the Transcaucasus. The founder of the "Fazis SP" enterprise on the German side is the "Wilfried Post" trading firm. It has been cooperating for more than 15 years with Soviet foreign trade organizations. The firm is involved in a broad range of activities: construction materials, machines, equipment, and furniture....

"Fazis SP" is intended to be a multisector enterprise. V. Tikhov, general director and chairman of the "Fazis" board, said of its functions:

"Our main aim is to develop and organize the production of competitive output and offer various services for sale on the domestic and foreign markets. The program for 'Fazis' activity includes organizing the production of metallic leisure furniture, caffeine derived from waste products from tea production, disposable medical instruments, and sails and other rigging for sailboats and various kinds of yachts. The enterprise will also perform brokerage services and promote the development of tourism."

**Vorontsov Talks in Ankara Described**  
*LD291950 Moscow TASS in English 1859 GMT*  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Ankara April 29 TASS—USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov was staying on a visit in Turkey on April 26-29. He held in Ankara a number of meetings with representatives of the Turkish leadership and also visited Istanbul. Yuliy Vorontsov was received by Turkey's Prime Minister Turgut Ozal and Minister of Foreign Affairs Mesut Yilmaz and had thorough conversations with them. Constructive talks with Turkey's First Deputy Foreign Minister N. Kandemir were also held.

During these conversations and talks much attention was paid to the discussion of fundamental matters related to the present state and development of Soviet-Turkish relations and also to topical international problems, including regional ones.

The exchange of opinions on matters of bilateral Soviet-Turkish relations confirmed the determination of both countries to develop their relations, increase positive elements in all the complex of these relations, also by intensifying political contacts and their further widening with the use of new forms and areas of mutually-advantageous commercial and economic cooperation, as well as scientific and cultural cooperation. Special importance of the strengthening of the legal basis of relations between the USSR and Turkey was emphasized. A Soviet-Turkish consular convention was signed by Yuliy Vorontsov and N. Kandemir.

When international problems were discussed, Yuliy Vorontsov informed the Turkish leaders of the main results of the latest round of negotiations between USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz held in Moscow on April 21-24. The importance of the further advance toward new agreements in the area of nuclear disarmament was emphasized in this connection. The beginning to this process was set by the treaty on intermediate-range and short-range missiles which is a concrete example of applying new political thinking.

There was a thorough exchange of opinions on a number of regional problems, including questions connected with the situation on the Persian Gulf, with the Middle East and Cyprus settlement. Yuliy Vorontsov set out to the Turkish leadership the contents and importance of the accords on Afghanistan signed in Geneva, the accords providing a basis for the settlement of that regional conflict in the context of international law and thus opening the way to the establishment of long-awaited peace on Afghan soil. The Soviet side expressed satisfaction with the positive attitude of the Turkish leadership to the Geneva accords on Afghanistan. The Turkish leadership regards them as success on the road of political settlement of the Afghan problem. Mutual wish was expressed that all the parties concerned should observe these accords precisely and unswervingly and that the international community should assist this in every possible way.

Analysing the situation in the Persian Gulf Area, the sides expressed concern over the escalation of tension in the area, especially in the recent period of time. They emphasized the need for an early peaceful settlement of the Iran-Iraq armed conflict on the basis of the implementation of the United Nations Security Council's Resolution 598. The closeness of the stands of the USSR and Turkey with regard to an immediate end to the "war of cities" and prevention of the use of chemical weapons was noted.

Touching upon the Middle-East settlement, the sides declared in favour of an early convocation of an international conference on the Middle-East with a view to resolving an Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of balancing the interests of all the parties and ensuring the lawful rights of the Palestinian people.

The exchange of opinions on the question of Cyprus settlement was held during the conversations. The Soviet Union's principled and constructive stand on Cyprus was reaffirmed. One of the elements of this stand is the holding of an international conference in the United Nations framework.

The conversations and talks in Ankara showed great mutual interests of both sides in vigorously developing Soviet-Turkish relations so as to bring them to a new and higher level of cooperation and good-neighbourliness.

**Karpov Meets With Spanish Officials in Madrid**  
*LD291930 Moscow TASS in English 1842 GMT*  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Madrid April 29 TASS—Soviet-Spanish consultations on questions of arms limitation and reduction were held here on April 28-29.

Chief of the Directorate on Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems of the USSR Foreign Ministry, Ambassador at Large Viktor Karpov was received by Spain's Minister of Foreign Affairs Francisco Fernandez Ordenez, met with chief of the Prime Minister's Chancellery P. Dorado. Viktor Karpov held thorough conversations with director general of the Agency for Security and Disarmament Affairs of the Foreign Ministry of Spain Carlos Miranda and with other officials. The USSR's Ambassador to Spain Sergey Romanovskiy took part in the consultations.

V. Karpov informed the Spanish side of the meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, of the contents of the talks between member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz in Moscow.

A wide range of questions pertaining to Soviet-American relations, as well as to multilateral talks on banning chemical weapons, consultations on the working out of the mandate of the talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals and other matters was touched upon during Soviet-Spanish consultations.

Viktor Karpov met with representatives of the Spanish mass media.

### Interviewed on Visit

LD301447 Madrid in Spanish to Europe 1130 GMT  
30 Apr 88

[Text] At the end of a three-day visit to Madrid, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov told EFE news agency that he does not think that the START agreement on strategic nuclear arms can be signed during the summit meeting between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev in May because there is not enough time left to finalize it.

Over the past few days the Soviet deputy foreign minister has briefed the Spanish Government on the difficulties existing in the negotiations on strategic arms, and he has won the support of the Spanish Government for the achievement of the START agreement. According to Viktor Karpov, the Soviet Union and the United States should now strive to achieve the maximum possible number of points of agreement, and postpone the points of disagreement until later negotiations. The United States and the Soviet Union, added Karpov, are laying the foundations for the achievement of stable relations.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister repeated that he did not understand Spain's need to join the Western European Union, saying that we have to strive to achieve the elimination of blocs, although the Soviet Union has no objection if Spain wishes to join another European organization.

Viktor Karpov was very cautious about the dates on which Mikhail Gorbachev may visit Spain. I think, he said, that he may be able to do so next year, because at the moment the Soviet leader has very little time at his disposal.

### Briefs

#### Soviet Television in Holland

The Hague, 29 Apr (TASS)—The inhabitants of the small Dutch community of Rijswijk in the suburbs of The Hague have been given the opportunity of receiving broadcasts of the Soviet television's First All-Union Program on their television sets. Rijswijk is the first community in the Netherlands where the reception of television broadcasts from the Soviet Union have been organized via the "Gorizont" communications satellite. The community's town council enterprisingly has become a permanent subscriber to the new TV channel starting in September. [Text] [LD300233 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0553 GMT 29 Apr 88]

#### Latin America & Caribbean

Gorbachev Talks With Uruguayan Delegation  
PM021215 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 April 88  
Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report under headline "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Arismendi"]

[Text] On 29 April at the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev met with a delegation of the Communist Party of Uruguay headed by Rodney Arismendi,

general secretary of the Central Committee of the party. Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Jaime Perez, deputy general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay; Leon Lev and George Mazzarovich, members of the Executive and the Secretariat of the Central Committee; Anatoliy Chernyayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee; and Karen Brutents, alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the meeting.

Mikhail Gorbachev regarded with profound interest Rodney Arismendi's comprehensive analysis of the processes in Latin America that assume world importance. The strengthening of the democratic positions of many Latin American countries, and their ever growing independence in solving their own Latin American problems and problems in relations with the rest of the world, have increased Latin America's international role. Rodney Arismendi emphasized how important it is now to see the novelty and extraordinary character of the changes that resulted in the fall of dictatorships and consolidation of democratic regimes in a number of large Latin American countries. He emphasized how dangerous it is for the Communist Party and how disadvantageous it is for the consolidation of all national progressive forces to gauge these phenomena by old yardsticks. He spoke about the activity of his party, which learned well the lessons of history and is building theoretical and political activity, taking into account the country's traditions, on the basis of today's realities and not quotations from books.

The interlocutors exchanged views on the essence of the party's vanguard role today both under socialism and under capitalism. Despite all inevitable differences, the following are decisive and common: democratization of the life of the parties themselves, the standard of guidance, the knack of renewing theory and policies, the art of introducing them to practice, and the ability to not only be with the working class but also to find a common language with the most diverse sections of one's society. The role of intelligentsia was emphasized during the conversation.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Rodney Arismendi shared their evaluations of the state of the international communist movement. Many problems exist which require a courageous self-critical analysis. The known weaknesses of the movement are in many respects connected with slowness in grasping theoretically and politically the fundamental changes that have taken place in the world and in individual countries in recent decades.

The quest for answers worthy of today's socialism and the communist movement brooks no dogmatism and no attachment to old schemes. Answers can be found only through voluntary joint efforts.

The interlocutors were unanimous that creative, free discussions were required for the renewal of the movement with a respectful attitude to each party, its history,



and contribution to the common cause. A dynamic dialogue, participation of the scientific forces of parties, and contacts and exchanges of views with other democratic parties are essential. Perestroika in the Soviet Union, in the opinion of Rodney Arismendi, creates the necessary atmosphere and impulse to such work.

The meaning of perestroika, Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized, is in realizing the potential of socialism and in recreating its Leninist aspect. This is not only our internal affair. It is of internationalist importance.

The new way of thinking presupposes that all complex interrelations and interdependences in the modern world, all contradictoriness of the interests of different countries and nations, are taken into account. At the same time, it has to do with a single human civilisation. Even given the presence of directly opposite socioeconomic forms in it, the main protagonist in any of them is the working people, i.e. the social force to the struggle for whose interests the communists devoted themselves.

Mikhail Gorbachev shared his experiences in working out the theory and policy of restructuring and of the new way of thinking. He took note of the importance of correctly understanding the essence and goals of the CPSU's domestic and foreign policies. This is a very important aspect of the ideological struggle already unfolding over these issues.

Mikhail Gorbachev shared his thoughts with Uruguayan comrades on preparations for the 19th party conference, which will be crucial for the entire further course of the drive for restructuring. Serious changes are to be made, he said, and far-reaching decisions taken. The drive for restructuring will receive fresh powerful impetus and new guarantees of irreversibility. The conference is called upon to make an important contribution to the theory of socialism as well.

Rodney Arismendi said that there was unprecedented interest among different sections of Latin American society to restructuring in the Soviet Union, that Latin Americans were looking forward to Mikhail Gorbachev's visit.

Concluding the conversation, Mikhail Gorbachev said that we highly value relations with the fraternal Communist Party of Uruguay, are interested in developing them, and highly assess the theoretical potential of the party's leadership. Each contact with it gives rich food for thought over the most complex problems of our day.

**Panama's Palma Decries U.S. 'Misinformation'**  
LD291158 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Havana April 29 TASS—TASS correspondent I. Pshenichnikov reports:

Washington has launched a campaign of lies and misinformation against Panama to thwart the fulfillment of the U.S.-Panamanian treaties on the Panama Canal, that envision the transfer of this waterway to Panama's control by 2000, and also to prolong the U.S. military presence in Panamanian territory, President Manuel Solis Palma of Panama said at an international trade union conference of solidarity with the working people of Panama, opened in the Panamanian capital Thursday. The forum drew representatives of 26 European and Latin American countries and also 15 international organisations.

According to news agency reports, Panama's military police have aborted the attempt by the right-wing opposition to hold an anti-government demonstration in the capital on that day. Panama's procurator-general Carlos Villalaz said at a press conference that security forces arrested ten members of the national civic crusade coalition. The search found that they had in possession leaflets with instructions to make incendiary bombs and explosive devices. He also said that security forces discovered a weapons depot that was planned to be used to stage unrest.

Washington April 29 TASS—Marlin Fitzwater, assistant to the U.S. President for press relations, said Thursday that the U.S. policy towards Panama remained unmodified. He made it clear that Washington intended to keep pressurizing Panama to get General Noriega to be ousted from the post of commander-in-chief of the National Defense Forces. He said that the U.S. policy amounted to getting Noriega to leave.

The U.S. press points out in recent days that the policy of power pressure on Panama pursued by the United States did not produce the desired results and the possible revision of the current stance is under study in the White House now, THE WASHINGTON POST writes.

**Panamanian Minister Condemns U.S. Pressure**  
LD021248 Moscow TASS in English 1219 GMT  
2 May 88

[Text] Washington May 2 TASS—Panama's Minister of Commerce Mario Rognoni condemned in an ABC TV interview on Sunday the USA's anti-Panamanian campaign of economic and political pressure on that Central American state.

The Washington administration, he said, is making every effort to achieve a change in the Panama Canal treaties which provide, as is known, for the turning over of that important lane between two oceans under Panama's control by the year 2000. Such a change is the paramount objective of the feverish activities by the White House designed to oust General Manuel Antonio Noriega, who firmly pursues the policy of national sovereignty and independence, from his office of commander-in-chief of the National Defence Forces. In the course of this campaign they use absurd accusations as,

for example, of Noriega's alleged involvement in drug trafficking. The USA, the minister noted, is also guided by the wish to preserve the U.S. military bases on Panama's territory in the next millennium too.

Pointing out that the Panamanian Government watches the strict observance of the Panama Canal treaties and resolutely rejects attempts at diktat by Washington, Rognoni stressed: "Panama's internal political affairs will be decided by the Panamanians themselves and not in Washington". The U.S. Administration made a mistake by imposing sanctions against Panama, two influential figures of the U.S. Congress recognized speaking in the same ABC TV programme. Representative Lee Hamilton admitted that the USA had made a series of miscalculations in Panama which cannot be mended. He declared for a diplomatic settlement of the crisis in relations with Panama.

Nevertheless U.S. Secretary of the Treasury James Baker, who was speaking on the NBC TV programme, was doing his utmost to uphold the tough measures taken by the administration vis-a-vis Panama. They envisage in particular the freezing of Panamanian assets at U.S. banks, ending the payment for the use of the Panamanian Canal and the transfer of practically all payments to the government of that Central American country, to a special New York bank account.

**Anti-U.S. Demonstrations Held in Panama**  
LD301447 Moscow TASS in English 1026 GMT  
30 Apr 88

[Text] Havana April 30 TASS—A multithousand demonstration of working people took place in the capital of Panama on Friday under the slogan of protecting the interests of people and the Republic's national sovereignty in the face of economic sanctions and the threat of a U.S. invasion. Demonstrating the indignant protest of Panamanians against the aggressive policy of the Reagan administration, aimed at thwarting the fulfilment of the Panama Canal treaties which provide for the canal's transfer to Panama by the year 2000, its participants marched through the city's central streets. "Yankees, get out of canal", "Down with venal oligarchy" and other slogans were chanted by numerous protesters all along the way to the Santa Ana Park.

Speaking at a mass rally held in the park, Victor Collado, deputy minister of labour and social welfare, said that only mobilization of people had interfered with the anti-Panamanian plans of the Reagan administration and home reaction as represented by the national civil crusade. Alvaro Munos, a representative of the United People's Front, denounced criminal plans of U.S. imperialism, which are called upon to strangle Panama economically and to occupy its territory so as to perpetuate the U.S. military presence here. On behalf of all the Panamanian working people, he demanded that Washington strictly fulfil the U.S.-Panamanian treaties on the transoceanic waterway.

Jose Marin, a representative of the Puerto Rican trade unions and participant in the 1st international trade union conference of solidarity with workers and people of Panama, also addressed the gathering. The working class throughout the world expresses firm solidarity with the struggle of Panamanians for self-determination, he said. The working people of the world are fully determined to protect Panama and to render moral and material assistance to its people.

The PRENSA LATINA agency reports that a press conference was held in Panama City on Friday. Speaking at the conference, the country's foreign minister Jorge Ritter refuted fabrications of the U.S. press about a reached understanding between the Panamanian Government and Washington on a resignation of General Manuel Antonio Noriega, commander-in-chief of the National Defense Forces. There was not and could not have been any agreement on this score with Michael Kozak, a representative of the U.S. State Department, the minister said, since normalization of bilateral relations should be the basis for any U.S.-Panamanian agreement.

**Former U.S. Army Officer on CIA Contra Aid**  
LD300317 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Managua April 29 TASS—U.S. secret services continue to provide military aid to the Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries in circumvention of the Congressional decision, Ian Crawford, former officer of a U.S. Army task force, said in an interview with NUEVA NICARAGUA news agency.

He said he had in possession reliable information that Richard Gadd, his former boss and subordinate of Lieutenant-Colonel Oliver North, went ahead with supplying weapons and ammunition to the contras using the private firm American National Management as a cover-up. Crawford himself took part in 50 covert flights to Nicaragua to ferry U.S. weapons to the contras in 1986. Crawford contends that North foresaw a possible ban by the U.S. Congress of military support to the Nicaraguan counter-revolution and issued an instruction to set up an appropriate network to ship weapons to the contras.

More, U.S. secret services use cargoes shipped in humanitarian aid to Nicaragua to deliver weapons to the contras, Crawford went on. Ninety per cent of these cargoes are weapons and explosives. Such actions cannot be carried out without the knowledge of top officials, he said.

**Sandinist-Contra Cease-Fire Negotiations End**  
LD011528 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT  
1 May 88

[Text] Managua May 1 TASS—A regular round of negotiations between the Nicaraguan Government and the contras on a final ceasefire drew to an end in the capital

of this Central American country. Humberto Ortega, defence minister who heads the Nicaraguan Government delegation, told newsmen that an agreement was reached to resume negotiations on May 12.

The policy of the United States is the key impediment to attaining lasting peace in Nicaragua. It puts pressure on the leaders of the counter-revolution thus blocking progress at the peace talks, Ortega said. The conclusion of specific agreements appeared to be impossible through the fault of the contras who abided by the line imposed on them by Elliott Abrams, U.S. assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, during the recent meeting in Miami. The counter-revolutionaries turned down several constructive proposals by the government, which envision a solution in the complex of all problems related to halting combat operations and the transition of armed anti-government groups to peaceful life.

The contras refused to receive humanitarian aid through the International Red Cross society and insisted that it be supplied by the U.S. so-called Agency for International Development which has close links with the CIA. They also categorically rejected the Nicaraguan Government's proposal for extending interim truce till June 30.

Contrary to their previous stance, the leaders of the counter-revolution demanded that the talks be transferred from Nicaragua to another country. So far, an accord on this question has not been reached either. At the same time, during the just-ended round of talks efforts have nevertheless succeeded to get the sides' views concur on 16 out of 32 items of the government's proposals concerning an agreement on a final ceasefire. [sentence as received]

#### **Contra Stand Condemned**

LD020847 Moscow TASS in English 0613 GMT  
2 May 88

[Text] Managua May 2 TASS—President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua has condemned the obstructionist stand of the chiefs of armed counter-revolution at the talks with the government.

Addressing a mammoth rally in the capital, the Nicaraguan leader said that if until May 30, when the term of the truce with the contras ends, no specific agreement was reached on ceasefire in Nicaragua and on the transition of the contras to peaceful activities, the Sandinist People's Army would launch a major offensive against the counter-revolutionary gangs in the country's territory. At the talks in Managua the government offered the contras to extend by a month the truce for resolving technical matters involved in ending war, yet the latter rejected the initiative of the national leadership. We cannot endlessly try to persuade the counter-revolution to end the war and after the truce expires we will launch a new offensive in order to rout ultimately the mercenary units, the president stressed.

#### **Document on Sanctions Against Nicaragua Noted** LD301728 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Washington April 30 TASS—President Ronald Reagan of the United States has informed the U.S. Congress of an extension of economic sanctions against Nicaragua.

In a semi-annual report to the leaders of both houses of Congress he maintained that the actions and policy of the Government of Nicaragua continued to pose an "unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States".

The document, circulated on Friday, emphasizes that the sanctions imposed in May 1985 "complement the diplomatic and other aspects of our policy toward Nicaragua".

Reagan maintained that the purpose of the measures was to make the Sandinistas enter into a serious and productive dialogue with the contras on a ceasefire, and with all opposition groups in Nicaragua "on democratisation in the country".

#### **Gorbachev Letter Read at Mexican Meeting** LD010904 Moscow TASS in English 0841 GMT 1 May 88

[Text] Mexico City May 1 TASS—Thousands of letters are coming in to General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev from residents of Mexico, including the younger generation of that Latin American country. Letters express profound concern over mankind's future, express the hope that owing to the Soviet Union's policy of ensuring durable peace and preventing a new world war, it will be possible to remove the threat of a nuclear catastrophe which is hanging over our planet, to save the lives of millions of people.

Answering these letters, Mikhail Gorbachev underlines that the Soviet Union has been doing and will continue doing the utmost in the interests of peace and disarmament, for the sake of preventing war. The Soviet leader's message was read out at a mass meeting which was held in Culiacan, Mexico, the administrative centre of the Sinaloa State, within the framework of the "Sinaloa Children for Peace" festival, held on the occasion of the Children's Day marked here on April 30.

The message was read out by the USSR's Ambassador to Mexico Rostislav Sergeyev.

#### **Cuba's Castro Opens Eye Unit, Thanks Professor** LD301511 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Cuban leader Fidel Castro has spoken in Havana at the opening of a special operating block at one of the clinics. It was set up on the pattern of a Soviet intersector



eye microsurgery scientific and technical complex. Fidel Castro emphasized that Cuba, by becoming the second country to possess such a complex, has taken an enormous step forward in the development of its health care. The Cuban leader thanked Soviet Professor Fedorov, who had presented the Cuban side with the technology, had helped organize work in the surgery complex, and had sent a large group of Soviet specialists there. Yesterday, five important health installations were opened simultaneously in Havana.

**Mokanu-Led Delegation Ends Visit to Jamaica**  
*LD011317 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT*  
1 May 88

[Text] Kingstown May 1 TASS—TASS special correspondent Mikhail Fotin reports:

A delegation of Soviet parliamentarians led by Aleksander Mokanu, vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, ended its official visit to several

Caribbean countries. Soviet parliamentarians visited Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago and Jamaica. They conveyed their counterparts in these three countries official invitation to visit the Soviet Union in line with inter-parliamentary contacts.

During its stay in Jamaica, the Soviet delegation was received by Prime Minister Edward Seaga and Governor General Florizel Augustus Glasspole, had meetings and talks with the leaders of parliament, at the Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of Mining, Energy and Tourism.

Summing up the results of the stay on Jamaican soil, the head of the Soviet delegation told a press conference that the talks with Jamaican leaders had been fruitful, constructive and had been held in a friendly atmosphere. They showed proximity or concurrence of positions of the two sides on a whole number of issues, above all on the problem of removing the nuclear threat.

### Political & Social

#### Gorbachev Meets With Patriarch Pimen

PM021237 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88  
Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report under the headline "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia and the Members of the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church"]

[Text] Some time ago, Patriarch Pimen addressed Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in a letter that voiced his request for a meeting in connection with the millenium of the introduction of Christianity to Russia. On 29 April, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev received Patriarch Pimen and members of the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church—Metropolitans Filaret of Kiev and Galicia, Aleksey of Leningrad and Novgorod, Yuvenaliy of Krutitsy and Kolomna, Vladimir of Rostov and Novocheerkassk, and Filaret of Minsk and Belorussia, in the Yekaterininskiy Hall in the Kremlin.

At the start of the meeting, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, I am glad to speak with you and I am ready to listen to you and to answer your questions. Our meeting is taking place on the threshold of the millenium of introducing Christianity to Russia, which has taken on not only religious overtones but also social and political ones, for it was a milestone of significance on the centuries-old road of development of the country's history and culture and of Russian statehood. It is a great and complex road, abounding in dramatic events and most bitter political clashes. However, I would isolate from it a segment, seven decades that for the Russian Church have been one of the most important stages in its history. These are seven decades of Soviet power under which the church lives and acts in social conditions without parallel in history. The decree proclaimed by the young Soviet republic on the separation of church from state and schools from the church marked a sharp about-face in the church-state relations that had developed in Russia.

That Leninist decree, the 70th anniversary of which was marked recently, opened up before the church opportunities to carry out its activity without interference of any kind from outside. Figuratively speaking, the liberating spirit of the Great October Socialist Revolution also touched all the religious organizations of our multinational society. Not everything developed easily and simply in the sphere of state-church relations. Not all hierarchs managed to grasp the essence of the decree straight away; time was needed to comprehend the ideas contained within it.

Religious organizations were also affected by the tragic events of the period of the personality cult. That period has been given an unambiguous assessment as a deviation from socialist principles, which have now been

restored to their rights. Errors that occurred regarding the church and believers in the thirties and subsequent years are being corrected. This is now being written about frankly and objectively by our newspapers and magazines; we hear from their pages the voice of the church and of you who are present here.

The Constitution of the USSR guarantees the equal rights of all citizens. In the name of real equal rights and real liberty, believing and nonbelieving working people accomplished the first socialist revolution in history, labored side by side in erecting the building of socialism and, during the years of the Great Patriotic War, fought at the front and worked heroically in the rear. A common destiny and very severe tests united all Soviet people, who defended socialism in the deadly fight with fascism. The memory preserves the patriotic appeals of the clergy in those bleak years and the mass campaigns to collect money for the defense fund. Combat squadrons of aircraft named after Aleksandr Nevskiy and a tank column named after Dmitriy Donskoy were constructed with resources that came in from believers.

While being called upon to fulfill religious functions, in particular, the church cannot distance itself from the complex problems that worry mankind or from the processes going on in society. The peace-making activity of the country's religious organizations and their contribution towards the struggle for nuclear disarmament are worthy of the very highest assessment. The clergy's advocacy of humanism and just relations among the peoples, and statements in support of the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state merit an equally high evaluation. All this corresponds to the aspirations of believers, to whom the humanistic ideal of socialism is close and comprehensible. Such a position meets with understanding in our whole society.

The overwhelming majority of believers have accepted restructuring, and are making no small contribution toward realizing the plans for the country's socioeconomic acceleration, and toward the development of democracy and glasnost. These conditions have made possible broad public dialogue and more active involvement of religious figures in the work of public organizations such as the Culture Fund, the Lenin Children's Fund, the Rodina society, and others. In response to a request from believers, the Soviet state has handed over to church jurisdiction the St. Danilov monastery in Moscow, the Optina Pustyn historical monument in Kaluga Oblast, and the Tolgakiy Monastery in Yaroslavl Oblast. The state has ensured the necessary conditions for celebrating in the country the 1000th anniversary of the introduction to Christianity to Russia.

A new law on freedom of worship is currently being drafted, which will also reflect the interests of religious organizations. All these things are the real fruits of the new approaches to state-church relations in the conditions of restructuring and democratization of Soviet society. We are currently reestablishing in full measure

the Leninist principles concerning the attitude to religion, the church and believers. The attitude to the church and to believers should be defined by the interests of strengthening the unity of all working people and the whole of our people.

We can clearly see the profundity of our differences in world outlook, but at the same time we take realistic account of the existing situation. Believers are Soviet people, working people, patriots, and they have the full right to express their convictions worthily. Restructuring, democratization, and glasnost affect them, too, and completely, without any restrictions. This relates in particular to the sphere of morality, where universal human norms and customs can promote our common cause.

Thus, we have a great many points of contact for a committed and, I hope, fruitful dialogue. We have a common history, one fatherland and one future. So let us reflect upon all this together.

There is only just over a month to go before the jubilee celebrations. On the eve of this event, I would like to express the wish that this event will proceed as a sign of uniting the believers in our country and all working people for the sake of the common great cause of restructuring, renewal of socialism, and full revelation of socialism's humane and moral potential. Today this is also inseparable from active participation in the struggle against the nuclear threat and for the survival of mankind.

Let the guests invited to the anniversary festivities and all believers on the planet see the peace-loving aspirations of the Soviet people. The highest blessing for the whole of mankind is to live in peace, never to experience terror at the approach of nuclear war, and to be at peace regarding the future of their children. We hope that the efforts being applied to achieve this blessing will find support from the church too, from which we await new, positive steps to defend the cause of peace in its peace-making activity. On the eve of a historic event for the Russian Orthodox Church, I wish you, the members of the Holy Synod, good health and further success in all matters aimed at the good of mankind and the preservation of peace on earth.

Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all Russia then addressed Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. He said: Please accept our most heartfelt gratitude for the fact that in spite of your being exceptionally busy you have found it possible to receive us, and through us, to show attention to the Russian Orthodox Church. This year, 1,000 years have passed since the baptism of Russia. Since that time, our church has been spiritually nourishing its children, confirming them in the principles of the Gospels and fostering civic virtues in them. The church has always combined its service with concern for the integrity of our fatherland and its protection from alien encroachments, the strengthening of justice in society

and the development of spiritual culture. In June of this year, there is to be the official celebration of the noteworthy anniversary. We are now completing preparation of this in order to mark this magnificent event in the history of Christianity and the history of our motherland in a worthy manner.

Most respected Mikhail Sergeyevich, on behalf of the bishops, the clergy, the monastic orders and lay people of our Church and the citizens of our socialist motherland, I express to you, the architect of restructuring and the herald of the new political thinking, our total support for this noble process. We, the people of the Church, are praying fervently for the success of this process and striving to do all possible to develop it. The Church devotes its efforts to the moral education of the faithful, the assertion in them of the dignities of the human personality, the strengthening of the sanctity of the family home and a conscientious attitude towards labor for the good of people close to them and for the whole of our society. The process of restructuring is having a favorable influence on the growth of our motherland's international prestige. This is perceived enthusiastically in the world's churches and we are promoting this by explaining to religious people the significance and aim of the renewal of the life of our society.

We see the success of restructuring in the fact that the ideals of a nonnuclear and nonviolent world proclaimed by our country have begun to be put into effect. We warmly welcome the Soviet-U.S. treaty to eliminate two classes of missiles. We are now devoting our assiduous prayers to your forthcoming meeting in Moscow with the President of the United States of America and we wish you blessed success. For our part we are striving in all ways to facilitate the creation of an atmosphere favorable to the meeting in the religious and public circles of the world.

The positive results of the process of restructuring and renewal are reflected in the life of the Russian Orthodox Church and in other churches and religious associations of our country. We can see this in the assistance coming from all sides during the preparations for our anniversary, in the opening of several monasteries, the registration of communities, the construction of new places of worship and in facilitating the solving of other pressing problems of Church life.

In connection with this, we note with gratitude the great help given us by the Council for Religious Affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers. For all of this, we express sincere thanks to you, most respected Mikhail Sergeyevich, and to all the leaders of our country. However, not all the problems in the life of the Church are being solved as yet. We hope that in an atmosphere of developing the democratic principles of the life of our society, they will find solutions favorable to the Church and useful to our state. May the Lord bless you and your labors for the good of our dear fatherland and for the triumph of peace and justice throughout the whole world.



During the conversation that ensued, the members of the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church voiced their full support for the ventures underway in our country to restructure and to renew our society morally. They asked a number of specific questions connected with guaranteeing the normal activities of the Orthodox Church. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that he would communicate these requests and ideas to the government which would examine them closely and take the necessary decisions. In attendance at the meeting were Frolov, aide to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Kharchev, chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers.

**Metropolitan Pitirim Comments on Church Status**  
*PM291038 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian*  
27 Apr 88 p 7

[Interview with Metropolitan of Volokosamsk K.V. Pitirim in Moscow by Ezio Mauro; date not given]

[Excerpts] Moscow—[Passage omitted] [Mauro] Metropolitan Filaret says that the Christian community in the USSR is growing. Do you agree?

[Pitirim] Yes, it is growing both numerically and qualitatively. There are some who approach, some who seek, and some who have already found.

[Mauro] You say this is important irrespective of external conditions, but how would you weigh relations between the Church and Kremlin, between religion and revolution?

[Pitirim] There must always be two sides to a set of scales, never only one. The Church is independent of state forms and social systems. It was born in Russia during a period of slavery, survived feudalism, experienced capitalism, and lives on now under socialism. It remains the same, independent of these external circumstances. In fact it is when it attaches itself to a particular structure that the Church ultimately disappears.

[Mauro] Is the 1918 Leninist idea of the separation of state and church being given a new boost?

[Pitirim] Yes indeed—in the interests of both state and church.

[Mauro] But according to the Scientific Institute director's plans, it is proposed to sever religion's roots to eliminate it. Can you live without your roots?

[Pitirim] The point is that they cannot sever them. They would have to kill everyone to extirpate them. Then others would come, nurtured from the same source. Cities, men, and entire generations have been destroyed in this country. Nevertheless the Church has remained, because our roots are not on Earth but in Heaven. [passage omitted]

[Mauro] The reform plan is stagnating at present. Do you believe the current struggle between reformists and conservatives also involves the Church?

[Pitirim] Yes, definitely. I would like to say this, however: We will proceed in any case, under whatever conditions we may find ourselves.

[Mauro] Is restructuring really providing new leeway for religion?

[Pitirim] Previously it was said and believed that religion should not exist. Now it is recognized not only that it exists but that it is an important moral and spiritual force and also an active force in resolving social problems. This is the new thinking. The rest will follow.

[Mauro] Patriarch Pimen has said that Gorbachev's initiatives are "blessed" and "close to the Christian spirit." Does that mean that your Church can reconcile Christianity with communism?

[Pitirim] I always say that there is nothing to prevent a good Christian from being a good citizen or patriot from being a believer.

[Mauro] Opposition Christians, however, such as Father Gleb Yakunin, criticize the Church's subordination to the government and urge Pimen to resign. How can you answer this?

[Pitirim] Yakunin's is a personal opinion, harshly criticized by the faithful. As for Pimen, he is patriarch for life and we take great care of elderly priests. Patriarch Aleksei was also a very ill man and we looked after him until the end. [passage omitted]

[Mauro] John Paul II has now also admitted that a wind of change seems to be blowing in the USSR. What obstacles still stand in the way of a dialogue between the Churches of Rome and Moscow?

[Pitirim] The old obstacles have not been surmounted—from the pope's primacy to a number of political actions, such as those concerning the Uniate Church. However, I would like now to tell our brothers in Rome that we must leave the past behind us and move forward together, helping each other without envies or primacies. Now it is the Millennium, and when one part of the body is happy the entire organism experiences a sense of wellbeing, united in the same rejoicing.

#### Reportage on Moscow May Day Ceremonies

LD010545 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0540 GMT on 1 May begins live coverage of the May Day festivities in Red Square in Moscow. The television shows panoramic views of Moscow and of the Kremlin. The camera then shifts to a view of Red Square which is decorated and filling up with a crowd of spectators.

At 0558 GMT the Soviet leadership, led by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, are shown walking to the reviewing stand on the roof of Lenin's Mausoleum.

The Soviet leaders are shown standing on the Mausoleum in the following order, from left to right: Andrey Gromyko, Mikhail Gorbachev, Nikolay Ryzhkov, Yegor Ligachev, and Mikhail Solomentsev. Other leaders present are not shown in closeup shots.

At 0600 GMT the May Day parade participants begin to pass in front of the reviewing stand. The television shows scenes of the parade, interspersed with interviews, including one with a leading worker (at 0608 GMT), and an architect (at 0615 GMT). Periodically the camera pans the leadership lineup on the Mausoleum. The following leaders are identifiable, from left to right:

Lizichev, Lushev, Kulikov, Akhromeyev, Yazov, Lukyanov, Biryukova, Razumovskiy, Demichev, Slyunkov, Yakovlev, Chebrikov, Zaykov, Gromyko, Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, Ligachev, Solomentsev, Shevardnadze, Vorotnikov, Nikonov, Dolgikh, Talyzin, Maslyukov, Medvedev, Dobrynin, Baklanov, and Kapitonov.

Interspersed with shots of the parade and crowd, Moscow Television shows views of the leadership and carries brief interviews with members of the crowd, including Hungarian and Italian businessmen on their involvement in joint enterprises with the USSR and Moscow TV's Tokyo correspondent on coverage by Japan's NHK television of the Red Square parade.

Camera shows Gorbachev, then pulls back to show Gromyko, Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, and Ligachev. Mausoleum lineup of leaders shown again, panning right to left. Same line-up as before, but Chebrikov not in evidence.

Gorbachev and Ryzhkov are shown waving to the crowd. This is followed by brief interviews with delegates to collective farms congress, and a reading of a verse on glasnost by a poet. Banner of Lenin, Marx, and Engels shown on wall of GUM store bordering Red Square. Gromyko, Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, and Ligachev briefly shown on Mausoleum.

Economist (Nikolay Petryakov) is interviewed on self-administration, self-financing and self-recouping.

The video then shows a closeup of Gorbachev on mausoleum, followed by a placard saying "Freedom to the Peoples of Southern Africa." An unidentified Nicaraguan representative and a Panamanian trade union man are interviewed.

Video gives shots of parades in Alma-Ata, Tashkent, Frunze, Dushanbe, Ashkhabad, Yerevan, Tbilisi, Baku. No leaders are shown.

An Indian parliamentarian is then interviewed on Soviet-Indian friendship and cooperation.

Camera shows Gorbachev waving, pulling back to show Gromyko and Ryzhkov as well.

Soviet-Bulgarian space crew comprising Solovyev, Tselynykh, and Aleksandrov is interviewed in Red Square; backup crew also there, followed by a shot of four Russian Orthodox church clergymen standing in the crowd.

Video then shows Gromyko, Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, and Ligachev on mausoleum. Later there is a panning shot with lineup as before, with Chebrikov back in position.

Sportsmen and women are shown coming into square "to end the parade," the announcer says. Olympic champions are shown on a big float topped by Olympic rings. Those in square form Olympic ring pattern. Schoolchildren in rings give gymnastics display. Gymnasts in the square form the word "peace." Camera shows shot of Talyzin, Maslyukov, Medvedev, Dobrynin, Baklanov, and Kapitonov on mausoleum.

People are then shown marching out of the square, followed by shots of Kremlin rooftops. Moscow Television ends its live coverage at 0808 GMT.

#### TASS Reports Parade

LD010702 Moscow TASS in English 0652 GMT  
1 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 1 TASS—TASS correspondent Kirill Ivanov reports:

The tenth strike of the chimes on the Spasskaya Tower of the Moscow Kremlin signalled the start of the traditional May Day demonstration of the working people of the Soviet capital. Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Andrey Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, other leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state and prominent military leaders came onto the stand of the Lenin Mausoleum.

Veterans of the party and labour, participants in the 1917 October Revolution, frontrank workers, men of letters and arts and cosmonauts were on the stands of the Red Square. Delegations of the trade union and labour movement from over 100 countries, of the World Federation of Trade Unions, which had come for May Day festivities, heads of more than 110 diplomatic missions of foreign countries accredited to the USSR also gathered here.

The march of a combined brass band was a ceremonious overture of festivities.

The square was filled with young men and women in bright colourful costumes. These were students of Moscow sport clubs. They brought to the square a wealth of red banners, pennants and balloons. Moscow schoolchildren ran onto the mausoleum stand and presented the leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state with carnations.

First columns of demonstrators entered the Red Square. Marchers bore streamers, balloons, colourful flags and flowers. Many came with children here.

Loudspeakers voiced congratulations on the May Day holiday. Bands blared festive spring marches.

#### **Shcherbitskiy Attends Events**

PM021253 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 May 88  
Morning Edition p 2

[Roundup of IZVESTIYA correspondents' reports on 1 May parades in major USSR cities: "The Country Greeted 1 May. On Working People's Demonstrations In the Union Republics"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Demonstrators were warmly greeted by the following: V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, in Kiev; and Yu.F. Solovyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom, in Leningrad. [passage omitted]

**Peace Policy Incompatible With Military Parades**  
18010333 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA  
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 22 Apr 88 p 2

[Letter from V. Melnikov, Simferopol: "Instead of Parades and Demonstrations"]

[Text] I would like to express an opinion on how we expend effort and means in vain to hold holiday military parades and demonstrations. We conduct a policy of peace and, in my opinion, it is incompatible with this policy to hold parades and at the same time to feed foreign propaganda on the military threat from the USSR.

How much labor and material go into the preparation of stands, posters, placards, artificial flowers and so forth? How many people are specially occupied in preparing for demonstrations and in ensuring order? I note that demonstrations are not as popular among the people now as they were earlier. I heard that in Bulgaria they have given up demonstrations, that there is only public merrymaking on that day and that is all. It seems to me that this question could be discussed by the participants in the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

**Zaykov, Nikonov Pay Visit to Moscow Shop**  
LD201327 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian  
2300 GMT 19 Apr 88

[Excerpts] A direct sales shop named Bird, belonging to the Stavropolskoye Broiler Association, opened in Orekhovo-Borisovo, one of the largest residential districts of Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon in Moscow on 19 April. [passage omitted] The shop was visited by Comrades Zaykov and Nikonov, who looked around the range of goods on offer. They were accompanied by Boldyrev, first secretary of Stavropol party kraykom; and senior personnel from the CPSU Central Committee and the Moscow Gorkom. There was a detailed conversation on the prospects for direct sales trade in poultry produce during which the great significance of developing this form of shopping service for the people Of Moscow was stressed.

**Zaykov Takes Part in Moscow Soviet Session**  
LD092127 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian  
1400 GMT 9 Apr 88

[Text] The draft comprehensive plan to provide each family in the capital with an individual flat by the year 2000 was examined at a session of the Moscow City Soviet today. The deputies confirmed the program and also approved the principal provisions of the draft general plan for the management of Moscow's economy. Comrade Zaykov took part in the work of the session.

**Biryukova Attends Meeting on Social Security**  
LD211246 Moscow Television Service in Russian  
2137 GMT 20 Apr 88

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A solemn gathering of staff and activists of the social security bodies devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Soviet state social security system was held in Moscow on 20 April.

The speaker, Comrade Gladkiy, chairman of the USSR State Committee on Labor, talked about the formation of the social security system in our country and its tasks in the contemporary stage of restructuring. The party and state are doing all they can to ensure that pension provisions for citizens grow together with the increase in society's well-being. Particular attention is devoted to veterans of war and labor, to invalids, and to families with many children.

Taking part in the meeting were Comrade Biryukova, heads of a number of ministries and departments, and representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations and of labor collectives. [video shows Gladkiy at rusturm; Biryukova in front row on platform]



**Kapitonov Attends Moldavian Party Plenum**  
*PM291235 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 2*

[Own correspondent report under general heading "Plenums Held"]

[Text] Kishinev, 27 Apr—The tasks of the republic party organization connected with fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum decisions have been discussed at a Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum. The report by S. Grossu, first secretary of the republic Communist Party Central Committee, and speeches stressed that the role of party organs in decisively renewing forms and methods of ideological and educational work, in mobilizing labor collectives toward implementing restructuring, and in democratizing social life should increase during the preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

I.V. Kapitonov, chairman of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, took part and spoke during the plenum's work.

**Central Committee Decision on Combating Crime**  
*LD121231 Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT*  
*12 Apr 88*

[Text] Moscow April 12 TASS—The CPSU Central Committee has set the task of elevating the struggle against delinquency and crime to a qualitatively higher level in its decision "on the state of combating crime in the country and additional measures to prevent delinquency." The document, whose main provisions are to be published in the press tomorrow, notes that after the April (1985) plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee and the 27th party congress (1986) discipline has somewhat improved, public order and law have somewhat strengthened in the country. Beginning from 1985 there has been a steady decline in crime. Last year the total number of crime cases declined 9.5 per cent, including grave crime—14 per cent.

At the same time, negative tendencies have recently manifested themselves. "A source of special concern", says the decision, "is a considerable spreading of the theft of state, public and personal property, bribery, cruel acts of violence in a number of places, an increase in juvenile delinquency, recidivism..." [punctuation as received]

The decision of the CPSU Central Committee makes it incumbent upon the party committees to analyse deeply the state of things in the field of delinquency and take the necessary measures for improving the situation in that field. The local bodies of power have been recommended to enhance organisational work for the implementation of the laws on the protection of socialist property and public order.

The USSR ministries of the interior and justice, the public procurators office and the supreme court have been recommended to take all the necessary measures to eliminate the shortcomings in their activities for combating crime.

**Yeltsin Comments on Dismissal, Interview**  
*AU011251 Paris AFP in English 1043 GMT*  
*1 May 88*

[Text] Moscow, May 1 (AFP)—Former Moscow Communist Party chief Boris Yeltsin, who was dismissed for "political immaturity" over a speech he made last October, told AFP Sunday that it was "not yet decided" whether a Soviet weekly would publish a controversial interview he recently gave its German-language edition. It was the first time the former Moscow Party chief had talked with a Western reporter since his dismissal in November.

Mr Yeltsin, 57, said after attending the traditional May Day parade in Red Square, watching from the Central Committee stand, that his health was "not bad." He said he had been working full-time at his new ministerial job for the last month after leaving hospital where he had been treated for heart problems apparently triggered by his dismissal. "But I don't stay at work until nine o'clock at night," he joked.

In his interview with a Soviet journalist for the first German-language edition of the weekly MOSCOW NEWS, available here on April 17, Mr Yeltsin showed no regrets about the speech which had led to his downfall, in which he reportedly criticised the slow rate of perestroika, and attacked fellow Politburo members. He was fired on November 11, and lost his non-voting Politburo seat last February. He also told MOSCOW NEWS that he had brought out of hospital and drugged in order to attend the November meeting at which he was sacked after making a "confession" reminiscent of the Stalin show trials.

The Russian language version of MOSCOW NEWS, a weekly in the forefront of the restructuring campaign, has so far failed to publish the new Yeltsin interview. Asked Sunday whether the interview would appear in Russian, he smiled wryly and said, "It's not yet been decided."

The Soviet Communist Party is currently wracked by internal struggle between conservatives and reformers as it prepares for a crucial meeting in June to assess the progress of perestroika.

The former Moscow boss, looking fit, and wearing a well-tailored brown overcoat, added that his health was "not back to the Sverdlovsk level", referring to his earlier career in his home town in the Urals.

Mr Yeltsin, who was named First Deputy Chairman of the State Construction Committee after being fired from his party post, had last year presided over the May Day parade from the Lenin Mausoleum with the other members of the ruling Politburo. His wife was wiping away a tear as the couple left Red Square on Sunday.

The "Yeltsin affair" caused dismay among supporters of perestroika, who feared that his brutal dismissal meant a victory for conservatives and the end of the reforms.

His speech to the October plenum, which has never been published, has caused such speculation that a false version is currently openly on sale for a couple of rubles around Moscow. Mr Yeltsin denounced the "falsehoods" in the version in his interview with MOSCOW NEWS in German.

**Chernobyl Documentary Premieres 29 Apr**  
LD292202 Moscow TASS in English 2134 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Documentary shooting made in the area of the Chernobyl nuclear power station from May to September 1986 served as the basis for a full-length film "The Tocsin of Chernobyl" about the accident at the nuclear power station in April 1986. The film had the premiere on television today.

The authors of the film interviewed those who lived through the accident—atomic engineers and firemen, helicopter pilots and building workers who took part in the clean-up operations to eliminate the consequences of the accident, people of Pripyat, the city of workers of the power station. Many frames, smudged with emulsion and having stains resulting from the radiation effect attest to the courage of the cameramen who were constantly taking risks in shooting the film.

"We set out to show the entire tragedy through the testimonies of eyewitnesses and to remind people what a horrible danger is posed by nuclear energy that got out of control", said Vladimir Sinelnikov, one of the authors of the script.

The film includes an interview with American businessman and public figure Armand Hammer who had visited the Chernobyl area. He holds that the film is of much public interest.

**Tatars Threaten More Mass Demonstrations**  
AU0205124788 Paris AFP in English 1203 GMT  
2 May 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, May 2 (AFP)—Tatar nationalists demanding the revival of the pre-war Crimean Republic have warned Soviet authorities that unless they get satisfaction they will repeat their mass demonstrations of last summer in Moscow. The Tatars, whose leaders met on April 23 and 24 at Pakhta in the central Asian republic of Uzbekistan, adopted a "plan of action"

involving the dispatch of "delegates" to Moscow in the next few weeks, a spokesman said. A total of 111 representatives were present at the Tatars' fourth federal assembly since last year.

Tatar spokesman Reshat Jemilev said the assembly had renewed its demand for the revival of the Crimean Autonomous Republic set up in 1921 on the shores of the Black Sea but abolished by Stalin in 1945. They also wanted the Kremlin to "organise the return" of Tatars deported en masse from the Crimea after the Second World War in reprisal for their alleged "collaboration" with the Nazis.

In addition, Mr Jemilev said the assembly called for the rescinding of "discriminatory" measures aimed at Tatars and for the "rehabilitation and release" of those prosecuted for their nationalist activities. "Anything else will be rejected by us," said Mr Jemilev in a telephone interview from Tashkent, the Uzbek capital. He said the Tatars planned to send a delegation to Moscow on June 20 preceded by a "smaller" advance party on May 18—the anniversary of Stalin's deportation order.

The Tatars would seek international support for their cause and wanted to see the Crimea question "freely" debated in the Soviet media, said Mr Jemilev. He said "other nationalities" would be allowed to join in the Tatar movement although he did not say which ones. [passage omitted]

**Subbotnik Accomplishments Detailed, Praised**  
LD291445 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian  
1100 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the AUCCTU, and the Central Committee of the VLKSM have summed up the results of the All-Union Communist Subbotnik held on 16 April and devoted to Lenin's 118th birthday. The subbotnik was striking proof of the political and labor activeness of Soviet people and their desire to meet the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in a worthy manner.

Over 157 million people took part in the subbotnik. They worked at their work places in industry, agriculture, construction, transport, and other branches of the national economy, and in improving towns and populated areas. A high degree of organization and efficiency were shown during the preparation and holding of the subbotnik. Many work collectives operating under conditions of full financial autonomy and self-financing independently planned the volume of work, concentrating on the output of products necessary for the national economy and the population and on the fulfilment of contract deliveries. Through their high labor productivity the subbotnik's participants made a worthy contribution to fulfilling the tasks of the 3d year of the 12th 5-year plan. According to preliminary data, almost 1.4 billion roubles' worth of industrial products alone was produced.

In many work collectives more products were manufactured than on ordinary days. A considerable part of them was produced out of economized raw materials and materials. The subbotnik's participants made a worthy contribution to fulfilling the tasks of the 3d year of the 12th 5-year plan. According to preliminary data, almost 1.4 billion roubles' worth of industrial products alone was produced.

In many work collectives more products were manufactured than on ordinary days. A considerable part of them was produced out of economized raw materials and materials. The subbotnik's participants earned and transferred to the 5-year plan fund 327 million rubles, including profits.

The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the AUCCTU, and the Central Committee of the VLKSM express sincere gratitude to all those who took an active part in the All-Union Communist Subbotnik: workers, collective farm workers, engineering and technical workers and employees, servicemen in the Soviet Army and Navy, young people, and war and labor veterans for their selfless and unpaid work. Taking into consideration the wishes of Soviet people and the suggestions of work collectives and public organizations, the resources earned on the subbotnik are being put toward the construction of children's homes and orphanages, boarding schools for orphans and children without parental guardianship, further strengthening the material base of rural and rayon health care establishments, and improving social and consumer services for labor and war veterans.

**Corruption Case Valuables Displayed in Moscow**  
*PM291211 Moscow*  
*SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian*  
*29 Apr 88 p 4*

[Own correspondent Ye. Kolesnikova report: "The Tip of the Iceberg"]

[Text] Moscow—In front of us was an iceberg. A dazzling iceberg studded with expensive old coins, gold bracelets, gleaming with the bewitching brilliance of precious stones. The banknotes laid out on either side of the long table looked drab by comparison.

At the sight of this, everyone fell silent for a moment—the quantity of the valuables staggered them. Then, virtually exploding, they all started talking at once, expressing amazement, indignation, condemnation.

This is just the tip of the iceberg, a fraction of the riches embezzled from society, colleagues were saying indignantly. How much more has been buried, safely hidden away somewhere!

One day all these treasures will, nonetheless, revert to the people. But first of all, it is important to give people back faith in justice and legality and the punishment of evil.

The tip of the iceberg is only the quantitative embodiment of the disorder, the corruption, the black economy—in short, of all the scum that floated to the top during the "stagnation" years. The time has come to tackle the bottom of the iceberg; only then will the tip disappear, too.

The investigation has not yet been completed, so we cannot name the people who are now expressing remorse, lamenting, and crying in prison cells. However, many of them are already known—Karimov, Rashidov, Ergashev, Medunov....

I am against the formulation "the Uzbek affair," which can sometimes be glimpsed in the press, T. Gdlyan, senior investigator for especially serious cases at the office of the USSR Prosecutor General, says. It is part of the general tragedy that has taken place in our country. The criminal threads lead to all regions and to the highest posts, and sometimes they end abruptly in Moscow. Thus, for instance, the investigation of a purely "Uzbek case" led us to L. Brezhnev's son-in-law Yu. Churbanov.

To begin with, we came up against tremendous resistance, N. Ivanov, investigator for especially serious cases at the office of the USSR Prosecutor General, adds. Even most of our colleagues did not believe in success. Many officials were simply too afraid to talk to us, to sit down at the same table, to shake hands with us. We were told that we, too, would soon be arrested and put into prison. Well, their fears were understandable—after all, we did not merely confiscate property; we were exposing the corruption of major leaders. When at the 27th CPSU Congress M.S. Gorbachev mentioned the sorry situation which had developed in Uzbekistan, leaders at local level tried to turn his words inside out to escape exposure. The information that came from our group was frequently stopped, as if by a filter, at the offices of party leaders who were afraid of the truth.

The situation changed a little, Nikolay Veniaminovich went on, when we were able to get through directly to the party Central Committee, when glasnost began to gain ground in zones which were traditionally out of bounds, such as the activities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and party leaders.

...Horrible pictures are flashing past on the monitor. An investigation group, equipped with shovels, is digging near a house wall. Guards, people whose duties included guarding bonds, gold coins, rings, and bracelets wrapped up in foil, are watching silently. When A. Karimov, former first secretary of Bukhara party obkom, was asked: "Why did you hoard so many valuables?" He looked confused and shrugged his shoulders: "Rashidov said: 'Collect. It might be useful for a rainy day.' And so they collected, openly demanding bribes."



But they also paid generously for social prestige: They became "toilers," "heroes" of countrywide fame. They were unstinting in "acquiring" orders and medals. Every one of them strove to build himself as expensive and solid a monument as possible during his lifetime, to have a portrait as big as carpet painted. For a diamond to sparkle, it needs an expensive setting. Modest millionaires of the Koreyka type, ready for any kind of ascetism to keep their dishonestly acquired wealth secret, became a thing of the past!

The rich, feeling safe behind their bought regalia, lived in luxury, afraid of nothing and no one, openly mocking the principles of socialism.

Incidentally, there were rare exceptions, Nikolay Veniaminovich recalls. Once we came across such a millionaire. He met us in rags; there was literally no food in the house. Noting our surprise, he said: "The gold keeps me warm, you must understand. I am an unusual person."

They were destroying our morality. They openly laughed at those who lived honestly. They dictated their own morality, a brutal, soul-destroying morality: You scratch my back, and I scratch yours. The power of money is inseparable from power over people. They bought people just as easily as they bought expensive goods, together with their posts, offices, and titles. These are the roots of corruption.

The restructuring in our society is mercilessly putting everything in its place, and the base of the iceberg which seemed so indestructible is melting.

**Uzbek Corruption Investigation Meets 'Resistance'**  
*PM291505 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88*  
*First Edition p 8*

[G. Ovcharenko, A. Chernenko "Special Report": "The Cobras Are Losing Their Venom"]

[Text] A few days before yesterday's meeting at the USSR Prosecutor's Office, we happened to meet Telman Gdlyan at the airport, and we helped him and his group to carry sealed bags with, frankly speaking, unusual contents down the aircraft steps. The surprising thing is that when you are tugging along these bags—each of which contains untold valuables—you feel absolutely nothing. Yet when their contents were spread out like a peacock's tail in one of the halls at the Prosecutor's Office yesterday, the sight made you feel quite odd. It sent shivers down your spine.

...It was as if this was not just money and valuables worth some R8 million, but a kind of murder weapon, a weapon which had killed ideals, moral precepts, and human souls. Yet the millions put on show for journalists yesterday had been confiscated from just two people.

And it was merely the "latest batch" of loot confiscated from the latter-day Uzbek "beyes" and brought to Moscow by Telman Gdlyan, head of the investigation team, and his men.

We listened to his account, and in our minds, we were back in the house of the cowed peasant who hid the "bey's gold." Although PRAVDA has already reported this in an article entitled "Cobras Guarding the Gold" on 23 January 1988, we would like to again stress the sad thought that the most terrible damage was inflicted on simple human souls by overreporting, widespread bribetaking, and corruption—in short, by Rashidovism. And it is incredibly difficult to restore the damage done.

Why make a secret of it?—members of the team headed by Gdlyan told us: It makes our work very difficult. We do not want the millions put on show here to be taken as a victory bulletin because this is by no means the case. This is just a trickle, while a mighty river is still meandering underground.

We could not help noticing the constantly cautious and tense expression in the eyes of these people back at the airport. That told us more than the most eloquent words about the atmosphere in which they have to work. When, in the very center of Moscow, at the junction of Chistoprudskiy Bulvar and Ulitsa Kirova, an unknown "Zhiguli" crashed into one of the cars traveling in our column carrying the valuables from the airport, every one of us traveling in a following car began to feel not quite himself. After all, we knew that there had been more than one or two attempts on Gdlyan's life. Then there was all that money! Furthermore, the red and blue flashlights were warning that a special column was on its way.... Was it a mere coincidence?

Right now, at a meeting at the Prosecutor's Office we are looking at a video recording, part of which is devoted to this incident. Here it is, that strange car...

Despite everything, I believe that it was just a coincidence.... Gdlyan is standing against the backdrop of the gold sparkling under the television cameramen's spotlights, and we understand that he very much wants to talk about everything we discussed the day before.

About the fact that the work which has been and is being carried out by the USSR Prosecutor's Office and the corresponding services of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is, despite all its efficiency, encountering covert and overt resistance: Certain lawyers are defending the view that the expensive gifts or "loans" extorted from subordinates and running into many thousands of rubles do not constitute a bribe as such. A long trial which promises to drag on for many a year gets under way.... Someone is spreading rumors that a sincere admission of guilt and a return of all the money gained by dishonest

methods or of "beys' treasures" deposited for safekeeping with ordinary people invariably leads to imprisonment. [Second Edition adds: "According to Gdlyan, these intrigues are spun even in very high places, including such places in the capital...."]

Here is a special kind of rumor: "Gdlyan and his subordinates have returned tens of millions of rubles to the state, yet they have not even earned themselves a medal. Their zeal is not being appreciated...."

It is not medals that are at stake here, of course. It is quite simple. Those who feel that the sword of justice will fall on them, too, tomorrow, if not today, are trying to create a wall of silence around our group, an atmosphere of suspicion which is to discourage those who would like to confess candidly....

Yet the investigation group has not broken a single one of its promises, as everyone must know.

...We had talked about all this the day before. Now, in the light of spotlights and the blinding glare of the flashbulbs, Gdlyan and his colleagues looked like the victors. You might get the impression that their work has come to a successful conclusion. How wrong you would be! The millions sparkle on a makeshift stand guarded by silent soldiers with machine guns....

However, it is becoming clear that the intricate spiral of corruption has the tendency to resist very stubbornly and that its end is nowhere in sight. According to a number of estimates, billions of rubles were embezzled during the period of the Great Bribe in that region. So far only tens of millions of rubles have been returned by Gdlyan's group, with the help of the Ministry of Internal Affairs organs. It would be very dangerous to present what has been achieved, despite the unquestionable success of the law enforcement organs, as the end result.

Nonetheless, this extraordinary exhibition is very significant. It fully illustrates the degree of glasnost, as well as the professionalism of our investigation experts, and the people's confidence in the authorities. After all, a considerable amount of this money was surrendered voluntarily. This in itself indicates that the cobras of all shapes and sizes, writhing on top of the gold, have begun to lose their venom and their fangs.

[Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition version adds: "This is also borne out by the latest report from Central Asia. Another criminal from the vipers' nest—S. Rakhimov, former secretary of Bukhara Oblast's Gizhduvanskiy party raykom—has been sentenced to capital punishment, to execution by shooting.

"The sentence is final and is not subject to appeal."]

**Dictatorship of Stalinist Elites Denounced**  
*PM271701 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA*  
*in Russian 26 Apr 88 p 3*

[Nikolay Popov article under the rubric "More Democracy—More Socialism": "Is Anyone Above the Law?"; boldface as published—first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction]

[Text] Doctor of Historical Sciences Nikolay Petrovich Popov is a scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute. The sphere of his activity covers the study of public opinion and its role in sociopolitical life and administration. He has recently been engaged in a comparative study of USSR and U.S. political cultures, and takes part in joint studies of public opinion. Our newspaper's readers remember well his articles "The Voice of the People in Conditions of Glasnost" and "An Individual's Rights and Something About the Ability To Exercise Them."

What has generated the author's keen interest in problems of a strictly domestic nature? The answer to this question is unambiguous: The revolutionary nature of the transformations in our society cannot fail to excite him as a scientist and as a citizen.

Political culture. What meaning do we impart to this term? If it went no further than the population's political literacy, their actual interest in politics, and their perception of processes occurring within society, it would be more appropriate to speak of "political cultivation." But what if a broader view were to be taken? In such a case we would be totally unable to manage without a description of the way society's political institutions are actually organized and function, of the way people participate in political life, in other words of the interconnection between people and authority. And of course, what are the mass conceptions of politics, what are the ideals and values, the prejudices and myths? We are talking about stable and durable political traditions embodied in actual practice.

During the epoch without glasnost, our thinking compatriots were especially exasperated by the real impossibility of actually analyzing political life in the country and speaking the truth about who we are, what we are building, and where we are going. Even during the period of the thaw in the sixties the centers of truth did not extend to the political system itself. "Further improvement" was the only possible development there.... In this way, political life proved to be the sphere where, until very recently, the official textbook ideology was further removed from actual reality than in any other sphere. Even though it is here that we need truth and clarity more than anywhere else.

The key question in any society's history is the question of political power—to whom does it belong and how is it exercised? It is here that the simplistic textbook approach has put down deep roots: Power in capitalist

states belongs to the bourgeoisie, in our country it belongs to the people. This would seem to say it all, and as for shades of difference—these are in the domain of historians and jurists. But the difference between bourgeois Greece and bourgeois Chile is as great as the distance separating the earth from the sky. Other Western countries offer a broad range of differences depending on the distribution of influence among society's different strata, the intensiveness of mass movements, and the political activeness of the population. The question of the structure of power is equally important for the socialist countries! It determines the entire style of social life. How did this structure develop in our country?

It is necessary to answer this question because the ineradicable thirst for concentration of power is one of our political traditions. Regardless of whether it goes back to Ivan the Terrible or Peter the Great, this tendency has also played a most important role in the Soviet era. There is no question that it helped to accomplish the revolution and to gain victory during the civil war and the intervention. It helped us to withstand during the Great Patriotic War. But how did it happen that the dictatorship of the proletariat, designed primarily to eliminate the bourgeoisie's resistance, was transformed in peacetime into—let's be blunt about it—the dictatorship of the upper echelon of power?

It has long been known that power in all its forms has the tendency to snowball. But the ways to contain it have also been known for a long time—ever since antiquity and the Renaissance they have taken the form of the legitimacy of power and its separation into legislative, executive, and judicial power.

#### How Did Lenin Perceive This Problem? [subhead]

Proceeding from the experience of the Paris Commune and the soviets which were set up during the 1905 revolution, he actually saw the soviets as guarantees for the new-style democratism. It was no coincidence that the idea of the working people's mass participation in the soviets' work and of the people's "universal" participation in administration was methodically developed by Lenin in many of his works. He returned to this idea time and again, also outlining the model of future self-management.

The most important guarantee of the soviets' democratism was assumed to be provided by the genuine freedom of their elections, without bureaucratic formalities and restrictions, with "the masses themselves determining the procedure and timetables for elections, with total freedom to recall those whom they have elected." It is well known that at the national level, following the dissolution of the right-wing Socialist-Revolutionary Constituent Assembly, the Congress of Soviets became the supreme organ of state power, with its functions between congresses being performed by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee elected by the congress.

The government—the Council of People's Commissars—was elected by either the congress or the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

There was no clear-cut division between legislative and executive functions at the time when these organs first came into being. Lenin repeatedly emphasized that Soviet power was better than bourgeois parliamentarianism under which elected representatives become a privileged caste. It was the right to recall deputies at any time and the nonseparation of the functions of power that ought to have guaranteed their dynamism and their monitoring by the people. In actual practice more laws were passed by the Council of People's Commissars than by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, even though legislative activity was still vested in the "Soviet parliament."

Many of our political norms and customs took shape within the brief 5 years when V.I. Lenin headed the state. The civil war conditions also dictated temporary emergency measures to save the republic. Following the removal [ustraneniye] of the political opposition—Mensheviks, left-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries, and other political groupings—the leadership of the party and the country was unified to a large extent. V.I. Lenin's authority was unshakable, while temporary deviations from proclaimed rules and constitutional norms were justified by saying that "Lenin knows about it" or that "Lenin has the situation in hand." Maybe the Council of People's Commissars is passing laws in contravention of the Constitution, but Lenin is chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, so what does it matter, we will rectify the situation later. Lenin was also the recognized leader of the party. It did not even cross the mind of any of his associates to say that "the old man" had concentrated too much power in his hands. Or that the functions of the supreme leadership organs overlapped, while there was no control mechanism to prevent concentration of power. Lenin's wisdom, his theoretical intellect, and his rare gifts as politician and organizer served as guarantees against any abuse of power in the upper echelon. Furthermore, plans for the future assumed the introduction of better organized administration based on laws rather than on emergency measures.

And there were quite a few such emergency measures. Take the administration of justice for example. "Temporarily," without any constitutional backing, the judicial organs were deprived of their autonomy, with "revolutionary legal awareness" being considered more important than their independence. The very first decree on the legal system abolished the Prosecutor's Office and the monitoring of juridical organs' observance of the laws. Courts were set up by local soviets, with the most important cases being heard by revolutionary tribunals with unlimited power to pass sentence, including execution by firing squad. Trials were brief. They were often correct. But the main point was that they were simple and reliable. While it was necessary during the period of fierce resistance by



the bourgeoisie and the period of intervention, a few years later this uncontrolled machine was let loose for repressions within the party and to stifle any dissident view in the country.

One of the main features of this period was the absence of any regulation of the party's role in the leadership of the country. After all, much seemed to be self-evident. The Bolsheviks took power in their hands—and they became the ruling party. "Our party is the party of government," V.I. Lenin said, "and any resolution to be adopted by the party congress will be mandatory for the entire republic...." The strategy of struggle dictated its terms. The underground party had to be transformed into a mass party—and the inflow of workers in its ranks was welcomed. Later on, the task on the agenda was to protect the party against adventurists and careerists—and the practice of purging its ranks and imposing restrictions on admission was adopted. But how about the need to struggle against other parties which disagree with the plans of the Bolsheviks and their leadership?

Lenin wrote in his work "The State and Revolution" in 1917: "By nurturing a workers party, Marxism nurtures the vanguard of the proletariat, capable of taking power and leading the whole people to socialism, of guiding and organizing the new system, of being the teacher, guide, and leader of all working and exploited people...." What is the specific meaning of being "teacher" and "guide"? Does it mean that Communists must head all state institutions? This is how it was at the beginning, but soon afterward there were simply not enough party members, and the party members did not have enough leadership skills. What was to be done? Nonparty specialists who were controlled by party members and commissars were recruited to leadership positions. This dual leadership style, despite various reforms, was an element of the political culture for many years.

Should the party leadership be a special organ of power, standing above all other organs of administration? If the Central Committee is a special organ of power, standing "above," how is it to be controlled? Is it possible to contest any of its decisions as unconstitutional? Who is to be held responsible in the event of the failure of a decreed measure? If this supreme organ in fact leads the entire country, should this organ not be elected by the whole people? The first Constitution of 1918 failed to answer these questions. Nor did subsequent Constitutions answer them. The definition of the functions of different organs of power was not the topic of broad nationwide discussion either in the first years of Soviet power or later on.

No, it was no coincidence that Lenin, in the last years of his life, wrote with increasing frequency about the danger of the uncontrolled power of party and state organs. It was no coincidence that he constantly returned to the question of monitoring by the workers, by the whole people: "The masses must have the right to elect responsible leaders for themselves. The masses must have the

right to replace them, the masses must have the right to know and inspect every step, even the slightest, in their activity." Furthermore, to inspect party organs as well in order "to eliminate the evil of the detachment of communist cells from the masses," in order to eradicate the legacy of war communism—Communists' isolation within a narrow circle of "rulers." He perceived the solution in the recruitment of honest nonparty people to more senior positions under Communists' control. On the other hand, he also deemed it important to recruit "nonparty workers and peasants whose honesty has been tested" to the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate.

Here is what he wrote on the eve of the 11th party congress in 1922: "Finally, it is necessary to demarcate much more accurately the functions of the party (and its Central Committee) and of soviet power; to enhance the responsibility and independence of soviet officials and soviet institutions, leaving to the party the overall leadership of the entire work of all state organs, without the all too frequent, irregular, and often trivial interference as at present." In other words, he is speaking bluntly about the demarcation of functions in the upper echelons of power. Today we can understand the leader's alarm.

The shortcomings of the administrative system under Lenin were compensated by his perspicacity and flexibility, but in the hands of his successors this imperfection became tragic.

#### How Did Stalin Perceive This Problem? [subhead]

V.I. Lenin's last warning about the danger of uncontrolled concentration of power was contained in the "Letter to Congress," where he wrote that the general secretary had concentrated boundless authority in his hands. The misfortune was that none of the existing structures had prevented this.... While there was no regulation of the duties of Central Committee secretaries, I. Stalin took advantage of Lenin's preoccupations and subsequent illness and gathered in his hands increasing control over the party. Over the party to begin with, that is.

Lenin departed this life rather early. Had his leadership of the country lasted at least a further two years, these two years in conditions of the New Economic Policy would undoubtedly have produced greater democratization of social life. The question of new laws would inevitably have arisen. The Central Committee's membership would have been enlarged with more workers. The Central Control Commission Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate, the superorgan of people's control, would have been given a special status. There would have been more glasnost and more public discussions of society's political structure, the culture of Soviet democracy would have started taking shape...

But this was fated not to be. The concentrated structure of power which prevailed under Lenin was inherited by people none of whom could compare in stature with

Lenin, who was a highly cultured and democratically minded theoretician, organizer, and politician. The recognized leader of the party and the proletariat was replaced by someone who had "his own views" of democracy. Let us add that, at that time, the leadership of the party and the state was far from united; it was rent by political and personal conflicts.

A morally unprincipled master of political intrigue, Stalin skillfully exploited these frictions. Allying himself with one group, he would remove another group and later on, with the help of a third group, he would destroy his former allies. With help of Kamenev and Zinovyev, whom he had supported as far back as October 1917, he managed to hide and suppress the "Letter to Congress" which was to his disadvantage, and to remain at the head of the party by sidelining Trotsky. Later on, with help from Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomskiy, he removed Trotsky, Kamenev, and Zinovyev from the political arena—only soon after to sweep the former three from his path.

In actual fact, Stalin created a political system of personal dictatorship in conditions of a developing socialist economic order. The uncontrolled personal power was comparable to that of a monarch. The proliferating omnipotent repressive apparatus provided additional similarity to the supremacy of someone like Ivan the Terrible. Similarities were also provided by the quest for enemies and by the forced "confessions" implicating other innocents. People at times had no choice: executioner or victim. Meanwhile, the main organizer was seemingly uninvolved in the chain of reciprocal denunciations, show trials, and executions of "traitors" and "spies."

Stalin destroyed millions of the best, enterprising, and talented people (we have yet to learn the exact magnitude of our losses). But the main point is that he created the ideal totalitarian state where his personal power extended over everything—the economy and science, literature and art. It is well known that he personally sifted the writers, repressing some while sparing others.

Democratic traditions and norms of social life were unable to develop and take hold in a semifeudal country during the brief period of its peaceful development under Lenin. On the contrary, the regime implanted by Stalin revived all the customs of the monarchy: Reverence for all authority, unconditional obedience to "bosses," disregard for civil rights and freedoms. There was not even a word said about the independence of judicial organs. The "troykas" became parodies of trials. Just think about it: Even the norms which progressive revolutionary forces had managed to gain in tsarist Russia were cast aside.

Stalin's methods were copied both horizontally and vertically within society. They were imitated by party, soviet, and economic organizations. The concentration of power expanded. How could there be any talk of criticism, glasnost, the real electivity of organs of power, the people's participation in administration, control, or

discussion of policy, of anything but unanimous approval? Today Stalin's methods are dead as a system of personal dictatorship and mass repressions, but they are still extremely tenacious of life as an antidemocratic norm. Faded little Stalins still exist among us, be they housing administration chiefs or obkom secretaries. Many people probably recall recent leaders and their leadership methods in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan, but they are also to be found elsewhere.

After all, this power system was implanted over a period of decades, and it is impossible to change it in just a few years. It may be a part of the past, but the past is still alive. It is no longer a matter of just the personal qualities of some leader or another. In order to eradicate the norms of voluntarism, bureaucratism, and dogmatism from our political culture it is necessary not only to replace leaders educated in the old faith, it is necessary to demolish the ossified system—it is often simpler to build a new cottage than to replace the rotten beams.

#### How Is This Problem Raised by Restructuring? [sub-head]

It seems to me that many of the questions agitating us will be left in midair unless there is a review of the constitutional validity and regulation of the functions and prerogatives of the various institutions of state power and administration.

It is obviously necessary to begin with the definition of the party's role in conditions of restructuring. According to the Constitution, the Communist Party is "the leading and guiding force of Soviet society" and "directs the great constructive work of the Soviet people." How specifically? How does this leadership differ from leadership by other institutions of power? The party's Statutes put it more precisely: It is the duty of the party's territorial organizations to exercise leadership of the soviets of people's deputies "through Communists working on them." The practice of the last few years has shown that this leadership "through Communists working on them" has extended also to judicial organs and prosecutor's offices and has spilled over into rigid administrative control of all rayon or oblast organizations by raykoms, gorkoms, or obkoms. In the event of disagreement with instructions "from above," any "administrator of justice" could find himself "on the carpet" and might even lose his party ticket. Does this type of control not contradict today's process of democratization? How is the prestige of elected organs, including soviet organs, to be really boosted in these conditions? Do we not have here a case of divergence from Lenin's principles of accountability and responsibility by elected leaders primarily to those who have elected them? This method of bureaucratic administration also runs contrary to Lenin's demand "to leave to the party the overall leadership of the entire work of all state organs, without the all too frequent, irregular, and often

trivial interference as at present." I believe that the rejection of the former traditions of leadership ought to be discussed at the party conference and enshrined in the party's Statutes.

Obviously, in the new conditions of growing self-motivation [samodeyatelnost] on the part of the masses and the development of new forms of cooperative and individual labor activity, there is also a need to amend the Constitution so as to consolidate the authority of our Fundamental—in the literal sense of the word—Law. When regulating the functions of the institutions and organs of power it will be necessary to review the outmoded norms and the habits of exercising management where no management is needed. The spirit of the times demands that the ancient principle—"Ask permission from the bosses, is it allowed?"—be replaced by something else: "If it is not prohibited, this means that it is allowed." After all, the general vector of development points toward the development of people's self-management; that is where our long-term future lies! Even today, anything that people can do by themselves must be done independently, without interference by the authorities. This applies to economic, social, and political activities alike. There are more problems in political activity than anywhere else.... Timid attempts to protest actions by local organs are at times cut short with the swiftness of a bulldog. Someone carries a sign which reads: "Glasnost Is the Weapon of Restructuring." He is bundled inside a militia van and driven to the precinct station: He is apparently in breach of public order. People join a demonstration in Irkutsk against a project threatening to pollute Lake Baykal—local authorities brand the demonstrators "extremists" and "firebrands"....

The fear of independence is also an element of our political culture, or rather of our agitational culture. The fear of any attempt by the people to interfere in the "sacred work" of administration. At times you get the impression that our Prishibeyevs [reference to Chekhov character who assumes the right to interfere in other people's affairs and push people about] have never read Lenin, even though they swear loyalty to him almost every hour on the hour. Or they may have read him, but have made a point of not burdening their souls with him. Order is the main point, let everyone know his proper place, we are quite capable of protecting nature, and let's have none of this self-motivation until an order is issued to this effect! As a matter of fact, the very word "self-motivation" has acquired a rather condemnatory meaning in the sphere of our social life.

Fortunately, the other flank of this political remnant of the past—the mass fear of any dressing down from above—is gradually, albeit slowly, retreating. It is, of course, terrifying to go against the bosses.... But people do sense that they have at least the truth, if not yet the law, on their side. In the conditions of glasnost they are learning how democracy advances and how officialdom retreats. But is it not time to give the fighters for restructuring more than just moral support? And not

only in the press? The rights of the individual must be expanded, and not just through the practical application of the Law on Procedure for Appeal in Court Against Actions by Officials. Today's self-motivated public organizations must be given a real chance to protect their members. Even in the courts, by the way—taking advantage of assistance not by chance attorneys but by jurists—defenders of restructuring both in the literal and the figurative sense—organized into associations.

One of the cardinal questions is the restructuring of the administrative apparatus. Restructuring is primarily a political matter. After all, we are talking about the replacement of one political culture by another, about political power and the elimination of a caste brought up on the idea of the absence of control and the permanence of all the attendant privileges. They will not disappear voluntarily; in their view, change means abandoning the lifestyle to which they are accustomed. They are capable of dissembling while banking on a return to old usages. They are capable of hiding behind restructural demagoguery. Or...they may not stand in the innovators' way, but nor will they be in any hurry to advance the cause either....

When embarking on the building of the new society Lenin feared most of all the bureaucratization of the revolution, the surreptitious gathering of actual control in the hands of the administrative apparatus. In his view, the new-style state ought to differ from the developed parliamentary republics where the actual administration is effected by "officialdom that is virtually permanent, privileged, and standing above the people." In the proletarian state this traditional machine must be dismantled and replaced by "a new, popular, in other words truly democratic apparatus of soviets."

How complex this work proved to be in an illiterate and backward country! Lenin remarked in 1923: "The situation with the state apparatus in our country is so lamentable, not to say disgusting, that we must in the first place think seriously about how to combat its shortcomings...." These "shortcomings" included the classical symptoms of bureaucratism. In Lenin's words, "when it comes to sycophancy and the observance of the forms and rituals of paperwork, our 'revolutionariness' is nearly always replaced by the mustiest slavery to routine." Many of the new administrators failed to find ways to combat the growing power of functionaries: "...a huge percentage of Communists are incapable of applying Soviet laws in the struggle against red tape, bureaucratism, or such a genuinely Russian phenomenon as bribery."

Lenin angrily denounced the isolation of the apparatus from the governed masses and the certainty that all tasks could be resolved by "communist decree." In Stalin's time this fierce struggle by the party against the bureaucracy was brought to naught, the apparatus proliferated even further and detached itself from the governed masses, becoming a machine of officialdom. Its best



representatives, the innovators who tried to follow Lenin's advice to introduce scientific organization in management and apply the Taylor system, or those who tried to maintain the ties with the masses, perished in Stalin's repressions. Under Lenin the party was "cleansed" of leaders who had become "bureaucratized" and displayed excessive communist arrogance, but during the subsequent decades the apparatchiks perfected their defense system by elaborating "golden rules" which helped them maintain their positions. Toadying, no initiative at all, action only in line with directives from the top and with instructions, rigidity toward subordinates, no indulgence or criticism! The brutality and inhumanity of the administration were particularly developed during the Stalin era.

In Lenin's time the apparatus underwent energetic renewal. There was "renewal" also in the Stalin era—the best part of the apparatus was periodically destroyed. Generally speaking, Stalin considered that the principle of reshuffling cadres was the guarantee of his personal power. The system became exclusive in the sixties and seventies, and the inflow of new people was virtually halted. According to the nomenklatura laws, apparatchiks started moving up and down, but mainly in a circle—moving from party to soviet organs, from there to ministries or positions in public organizations, and back again. The failures, the "burned-out" ones, rarely quit the rat race and, with the passage of time, often resurfaced in a decent position. A broad but exclusive caste of professional bosses took shape, something which in other countries is usually called a ruling elite. Our only consolation could be the fact that we are not the only victims of this sickness. The transformation of democracy into bureaucracy when power is uncontrolled is a typical process. It must be openly admitted: Lenin's fears have been confirmed. We have developed our home-grown "officialdom that is virtually permanent, privileged, and standing above the people." Whenever we speak of bureaucracy we are not talking about petty slaves to routine—we are actually talking about a political elite which brought the country to stagnation and led it to the brink of crisis. Demagoguery and dogmatic prohibitions were used to conceal its unwillingness to implement a reform of the economy and our entire social life. The purpose of the restructuring launched by healthy and revolutionary forces within the party is to demolish this apparatus. Resistance by this elite is the basis of the retardation process. But since bureaucracy is a political category—we are after all talking about the detachment of executive power from society's interests—the struggle against it is also political.

What are the forces and reserves at our disposal in this struggle? Primarily the utilization of the soviets, this instrument of power which was created by our revolution! It is they, as a matter of fact, that distinguish our system from the bourgeois parliamentary republics. We must restore the soviets' social purpose. And we must begin by restoring genuine electivity with several candidates for each deputy seat, with election campaigns.... Throughout

the years of Stalin's dictatorship, voluntarism, and stagnation, the culture of elections—and not just elections for soviets—was degraded to the point of silent approval of any nomination handed down from above. That is how party committee secretaries and kolkhoz chairmen were also elected. A new wave of electivity is sweeping through industrial enterprises. The effect of such democratic "practices" must also be felt in elections to party organs. After all, the democratization of elections lies not only in changing laws and procedures but also in whether the people are willing to elect, whether they would believe in the likelihood of changes. We are talking about one of the most effective cures against political apathy, about serious and fundamental changes in political culture.

And a breakthrough is already discernible. The explosion of initiative is one of the main results of restructuring. Economic experimenters, activists campaigning for the protection of the environment and of ancient monuments, cooperatives, informal youth groups, societies, and foundations, and—which may be the main point—sharply increased interest in public life, in politics! The country is on the move, people are reading, people are talking aloud. This is not yet the "rally democratism, turbulent, gushing forth like the water from the spring thaw, bursting all the banks," but people are already different and it will be difficult to lull them to sleep again.

During the period of stagnation, and even in the more tragic times, there were people who did not give way, who did not despair when surrounded by crooks, time servers, and arrogant functionaries, who continued to develop their inventions, to write their books, to make movies, and to uphold the truth each in his own fashion. Many of them have not survived. Life is now easier for such people. But the struggle for restructuring also has its heroes and its losses, its people who have lost their heads or who have openly switched to the conservative camp. The success of restructuring depends on major reforms—both economic and political—and their successful implementation. But it also depends on the slow and not always perceptible advance in awareness, including political awareness, on the introduction of various aspects of democratization into our political culture. Our life today is made interesting by the unexpected developments it offers with each passing day. We still do not know what the political culture of restructuring will be like in 5 years' time. Now is the time for the creativity of the masses, just as it was 70 years ago.

**Journalist Union Leaders Debate Current Tasks**  
PM281601 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian 26 Apr 88 p 2

[Unattributed report: "The Press and Restructuring"]

[Text] Helping the party to provide ideological support for the pressing problems of the radical economic reform now under way in the country is the duty of every member of the creative union. This was the keynote of the latest USSR Journalists Union Board plenum, held 20 April.

The plenum was opened with an introductory speech by V. Afanasyev, chairman of the USSR Journalists Union Board and chief editor of PRAVDA. The CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, he said, described the press as the weapon of ideological renewal. But the press itself needs renewal and restructuring.

We support, albeit still inadequately, the champions of restructuring. We disseminate their experience, we support the innovators. But we are still not completely successful. This is largely because we have not yet mastered the new topics defined by the party.

Therefore, our main task is: Without slackening criticism and the critical pressure in our writings, without easing the urgency of problems, and without leaving any "blank spots" in history, we must primarily help the party and the state in their quest for ways, means, and methods to solve the practical problems of restructuring. We must continue to support, generalize, and disseminate front-ranking experience and publicize the enthusiasm and the best collectives and regions starting with small rural territories and ending with the republics. We must ensure that front-ranking experience is made available to all concerned.

The report by A. Baranov, secretary of the board and chief editor of SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, entitled "The CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum and the Role of Journalists' Organizations in the Implementation of Economic Reforms," emphasized that the editorial offices of central and local newspapers and journals, radio and television workers, and Journalists Union organizations deem it their paramount duty to participate in the implementation of the radical economic reform, the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum decisions. Helping the party provide ideological backup for the pressing problems is the duty of every member of the creative union.

While discussing the problems of the ideology of renewal we must clearly perceive that the growing dynamism of political life in the country, the new thinking coupled with the activation of the masses, have created prerequisites for a qualitatively new standard of work by the mass media. Perhaps the most tangible proof of this process can be seen in the revival of genuine discussions on fundamental questions of our development, including world outlook questions.

The press has accurately captured people's need to speak publicly on the main questions. A natural consequence of this is that readers should not be tarred with the editorial brush but should be given the right to express their opinion, so that everyone could see that something has been written not by a newsman but by the person who wrote the letter to the editorial office. Readers must get used to the fact that a newspaper may publish different opinions.

A newspaper's stance and its party approach to the solution of our problems must be always visible in discussions. The mass media are not just mirrors of public opinion but also an active instrument for shaping it, a powerful tool of political agitation and propaganda.

It is indicative that ministries and departments have never once initiated any discussion so far. This is the effect of the fear of glasnost, the fear of acting in public, and ultimately the fear of democratization of management.

The conclusion is this: The mass media have become the most active participants in the implementation of economic reform.

The experience of the first few months of restructuring has shown that we all have major, all-out battles to fight against the active adversaries of reform, whose resistance is already beginning to swell. How much justified anger was poured over the emerging Soviet functionaries by V.I. Lenin! Bureaucracy today is the main adversary of the radical economic reform. Sealing its fate not by blunt orders—these are not in fashion now—but by unattainable normatives, by state orders which exceed the planned volume of production, or by a careless attitude to material supplies—this is the style of contemporary bureaucrats.

How pleased they are with our mistakes, with our blunders! Nothing draws more attention than an unsuccessful action by a newspaper, journal, radio, or television. There is no leniency to be expected.

The nature and methodology of articles on production topics constitute an important aspect of journalism. All business articles differ in their topics, presentation styles, and other features. Many of our journalists' articles are perceived as economic detective stories. They are written with such skill. But even though some materials may give an impression of sensationalism, they are strictly businesslike. What is sensational is the situation itself, which had not changed for years and decades and had become so fantastic and surprising for many people.

What is wrong with newspaper sensationalism, provided it is not a product of a journalist's imagination but taken from life itself! Surely there are enough unusual events in our country—events to which we are not accustomed that are yet natural and conform with common sense.

The USSR Journalists Union Board has taken a course of enhancing the professional competence and specific knowledge of journalists on topical problems of the economic reform. A 3-day conference on "Restructuring Economic Management in the Country in Light of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum Decisions and the Role of Mass Media" was organized in Moscow. The best journalists' organizations, which have accumulated experience of positive work, are used as bases for new-style training of various categories of

journalists, including courses on "The CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum and the Experience of Belorussian Railroad Workers" in Minsk, on "Science and the Press in Conditions of Restructuring and Acceleration" in Dubna, and on "Machine Building—Leading Sector of the Country's National Economy" in Rzhev. A new economic instruction system came into force following the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum. This has forced journalists to take a closer look at the problem of economic literacy—both their own and that of all working people.

It is possible to speak of initial positive changes. Newspapers and journals—and not just central ones—now carry rubrics devoted to universal economic instruction.

The instruction of journalists themselves has been noticeably stepped up. This was noted in particular at a plenum of the Belorussian Journalists Union Board held a few days ago. The creative section of journalists who cover the topic of the economy and of scientific and technical progress has noticeably activated its work there.

Creative section discussions are being adopted with growing effectiveness on periodical press publications on specific current problems from the viewpoint of their literary merits, competence, and purposefulness with subsequent reports to the editorial office.

Restructuring is generating serious problems. When raising them, we must adopt principled party positions. What this means for us specifically today is that newspapers, journals, and television remain mouthpieces of the party and conductors of its principled line, instead of expressing individual opinions or group aspirations.

The plenum fully shares the assessments and conclusions of the PRAVDA editorial article "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionary Thinking and Action" and expresses support for the declaration by creative unions issued in connection with it.

Plenum participants emphasized in their speeches that mass media act assertively and militantly, raise questions of economic development in a principled fashion, help to disseminate the living initiative of labor collectives, and focus the spotlight of glasnost on those who oppose and hinder restructuring.

At the same time not all journalists have restructured themselves or sensed their personal responsibility for social renewal, and not all display the proper competence and background knowledge when reporting the processes now occurring in the country. In the pursuit of larger circulations, some publications rush to publish unverified facts or immature and subjective opinions, limiting themselves to half-truths. There are instances when editorial offices forget that criticism is primarily a

responsibility, that the existence of different opinions and viewpoints does not mean total license but presupposes democratic discussions aimed at the quest for truth.

The participants in the USSR Journalists Union Board adopted an address to the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Journalists are firmly convinced, it says, that glasnost and democracy are incompatible with any monopoly on truth, cliquishness, or half-truth, let alone with the lie being used by the adversaries of restructuring as a banner for adventurist attacks which retard all-around renewal and the full utilization of the potential of socialism in man's interests.

Glasnost and democracy cannot and must not under any circumstances be used to the detriment of the cause of Lenin's party and the multinational Soviet people.

The plenum proposed:

To introduce into the CPSU Statutes a stipulation that the mass media are a component of all-party work. To examine the question of further democratization of the forms and methods of party leadership of the press and broader representation of mass media workers on elected party and soviet organs;

To help the press achieve a qualitatively new level of action by ensuring that journalists have broad access to sources of information and by submitting to exacting party assessment any instance of divergence between the presentation of a fundamental question in the press and its practical solution.

V. Sevruck, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, took part in the plenum's work.

**'Excessive Regulation' of CPSU Practice Noted**  
*PM281401 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 26 Apr 88 p 1*

[Letter from G. Vildanova, member of the Kazan CPSU Gorkom Bureau and leader of a construction industry workers team, under the rubric "19th All-Union Conference: I Submit for Discussion!": "A Raykom or an Emergency Service?"—boldface as published]

[Text] Let's be frank: The prestige of Communists declined during the years of stagnation. We spoke rather too much about the monolithic unity of the party and the people, and failed to notice how mistrust developed. This was because one thing was said, and something else was done. What happened was that, in parallel with honest people whose hearts were aching as a result of our misfortunes, the party ranks contained many indifferent, timorous people, and even careerists, who looked on their party card as a pass to a leadership position and personal advantage. Hence the negative attitude to people.



I think that the question of blocking access to the party ranks for casual people is more acute than ever before. This could be done only by abandoning the dogma of percentage proportions when admission is regulated according to people's belonging to various social groups. I realize that there is no room for anarchy, but dragging someone into the party simply because his record fits within the notorious percentages is a gross violation of the CPSU Statutes. This is not a matter of isolated cases: Anyone reading this letter could cite appropriate examples.

At our construction site, for example, young foremen and skilled craftsmen—those who are in the thick of labor collectives—are consciously striving for party membership. Alas, they are not supported: There are no "vacancies for workers...."

Let us also look at recommendations. Anyone who has had occasion to make a recommendation can recall all the trouble involved in formulating it properly: sticking to correct margins, proper sentences, and the right terminology.... What is the point in all this paperwork? Why should the person making the recommendation not describe freely, and therefore more sincerely, the human and professional qualities of the person whom he proposes? Or is a beautifully and precisely laid out piece of paperwork more important?

Much, very much in our party home has been excessively bureaucratized and subjected to excessive regulation, a fence of written and unwritten rules and conventions has been erected. Meetings of communists from a primary party organization must be held once a month, on the first Wednesday. But what is wrong with Friday? And why once a month? Common sense indicates that a meeting of communists must be held whenever it might be actually necessary—to discuss pressing problems. As for holding meetings just for the record—we all know the results.

Someone might say that these are trivia. I disagree. This is actually one of the stereotypes that holds back initiative. Here is another: For example, a party Central Committee plenum is held. It is immediately followed, as if by a chain reaction, by obkom, gorkom, and raykom plenums, shop party meetings, and party group meetings.... All of them follow exactly the same agenda. Is this always necessary?

We all await with great impatience the all-union party conference. I think that an exacting conversation will take place as to whether everything in our party home is suitable. The time has come to dust out all the corners, clean all the windows, and even "redesign the premises." I realize that the structure and apparatus are determined by the CPSU Central Committee as if local party organs were incapable of deciding what departments and how many people they need. But it is obvious that the prevailing sectoral structure of party committees, be they

gorkoms or raykoms, fails to meet the demands of restructuring, and these committees should not be shaped according to a standard model. After all, today it is an open secret that the majority of apparatus workers are not engaged in their proper work but are duplicating the work of local soviet and economic organs. We have actually reached the point where the raykom is like an emergency service: No matter what happens anywhere or to anyone, the initial reaction is to telephone the raykom. They are the people who will help and sort things out—they will supply faucets; they will ship concrete.... What sort of political work is that? Hence the question: Are there not too many leadership offices? Are there not too many desks in each one of them? Each desk emitting its own rustle of paperwork, "processing" decisions. As to the abundance of decisions that have been made—countless. And the result is well known.

Or take a different situation, for example. An educated, energetic, fairly talented young person joins the apparatus. Look at him about 6 months later, and you won't recognize him. He has become a newly sprouted bureaucrat, drowning in information, quickly accustomed to the office atmosphere and the edicts. The substitution of pretense for actual work is generally intolerable, and it is especially intolerable in party work. Not for nothing is party work known as the science of dealing with people.

Let the gorkom or raykom apparatus be cut back: This will only improve the returns from it. The center of gravity of all work must lie within the primary organization. This is the link that must be consolidated. But what is actually happening now? Take, for example, a subdivision like a construction administration. Who heads its primary party organization? As a rule, it is the chief of one of its departments, who is already up to his neck in his own work. There he is, rushing around and earning no more than his official salary—he is not a full-time secretary. But is it possible to tackle party work on a part-time basis, incidentally, in between other work? Especially in plants and at construction sites, in the thick of the working people? It would be logical to consolidate primary party organizations at the expense of the proliferated apparatus in the top links of party leadership.

G. Vildanova, member of the Kazan CPSU Gorkom Bureau and leader of a construction industry workers team, Kazan

**'Top Priority' Discusses Party Conference**  
*LD301953, Moscow in English to North America*  
2300 GMT 29 Apr 88

["Top Priority" program presented by Pavel Kuznetsov with Drs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov from the United States of America and Canada Institute]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to "Top Priority." I'm Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. Now, together with me in the studio are our usual panel, Drs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the Moscow-Based Institute for USA and Canada Studies.

In the second part of June we are going to have a national party conference, the 19th in our history. Last time we had such a conference or a party forum was back in 1941. Now that we're preparing for the conference an open debate has broken out in our press and in our mass media revolving around recent publications in our two leading party newspapers, that is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA or the SOVIET RUSSIA and PRAVDA, the leading Communist Party newspaper. This debate revolves around the fate of glasnost and perestroika: Where we stand with regard to this new policy, where we should go, how far, how fast, and so on.

The first article, which appeared on 13th March in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, was called, was described as a platform or a manifesto of the conservative anti-perestroika forces, and after a short period of tense silence, PRAVDA came out with a very sharp, with a very strong rebuke.

I would like one of you to start the program rolling by saying why such a clash on ideas. Was it imminent? Could it be headed off? Dr Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Well, I, just a couple of days ago, I met a very famous American journalist who happened to be in Moscow. He's very intelligent and knowledgeable person; he writes very often on the Soviet Union. I respect him very much. And he put to me the same question. What does it mean that you and this American journalist have the same question? It means that there is some misunderstanding. Why? Just an article published in the newspaper, even such an important paper as SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA or PRAVDA, makes such a noise as some tragic, dramatic event (?happen), that question he put to me.

[Kuznetsov] But it is a dramatic event.

[Bogdanov] Yeah. He put it to me in that way: Look, you publish so much, you publish this and that, what does it change if Soviet SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA has its own view? So is it a revolution or counterrevolution? What you are so, so, so...

[Kuznetsov] Excited.

[Bogdanov] ...Excited about that? Why? I told him: Look, this was not just an article, simple article. This thing is called in the PRAVDA article is a manifesto of conservative force. But for me it's something else than that, it is more than that. In any movement you have a critical moment, when you have to express yourself just to show the banner that I am here, I am with this idea. One day or the other that was bound to happen. And we just took that article in that way. That the period of reorganization or organization of conservative forces reached such a level when they were ready to manifest, to make a signal to everybody that we are here. That's why that was taken in such a dramatic, dramatic way. And if you have a manifesto, if you have a right to that

conservative view, of course, you have a right to a counterview. And PRAVDA is a little bit more. More influential, more, more [chuckles] little bit...

[Kuznetsov] More than a little bit.

[Bogdanov] Yeah, more than a little bit, more influential, more authoritative than that paper, so PRAVDA published one page of, it was not an answer, let me put it that way, it was another manifesto...

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, that's right.

[Bogdanov] It was a manifesto of progressive forces. Now you have on the table two views: one is conservative and the other one is progressive. This is very artificial division but I believe for the time being we have no better, better definition of the position. You have these and you have a political fight between them. Mind you, political, you have no means to send them to prison or you have no desire...

[Plekhanov] It's a battle of ideas.

[Kuznetsov] Yes.

[Bogdanov] It's a, you have no desire to deal with them in a traditional Stalinist way.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah.

[Bogdanov] You are fighting them politically. What does it mean? You should demonstrate how strong you are, who are supporting you, where is the majority: With them or with you? So you need time for that. And if it is a political fight what means [do] you have? You have party meetings and at the party meetings you have members of the party expressing themselves; you have letters from the leaders, and so on and so on. And now, now, today, we can state with full responsibility that the PRAVDA article has major support...

[Kuznetsov] ...overwhelming...

[Bogdanov] ...overwhelming support, not [word indistinct]. That's my point.

[Kuznetsov] If I understood you correctly, Dr Bogdanov, you said that for every society it is a very healthy thing, a very healthy phenomenon to have all kinds of views. Some kind of political pluralism. In other words, a mix, a combination of all kinds of streams, conservative, middle of the road, progressive, and so on. But that publication in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA was not just a view, it was a platform, like you said, it was a signal that the conservative forces have already rallied. This what, er, this is what happened shortly before the 19th party conference and that is why there was such a strong reaction from the leading Communist Party newspaper PRAVDA—is that so?

[Bogdanov] Yes, that's my point, that's my point.

[Kuznetsov] All right. My question to Dr Plekhanov. I think, in my view, the crucial point of the current debate, and not only on those two publications, is the role of Stalin, and not only as a personality, a very controversial political figure who was behind, or as some newspapers suggest, he was orchestrating or leading the mass purges in the thirties and in the fifties, but Stalin was also the creator of this very rigid command and control administrative system, not only in the economy but in all spheres of life. Would you agree that our attitude to that period in our past, to Stalin, is what divides the conservative and progressive forces, or is it something artificial?

[Plekhanov] No, that's not artificial; that's a very natural thing. In the first place, when we started telling the truth about the times of Stalin in the late fifties and early sixties we did not complete the job. We stopped at mid-point and then tried to forget about the whole thing for about 2 decades. And when you, you can't deal with history like that, you have to get the full story if you want to be honest with yourself and if you want to move forward. So what we're now doing is completing, finishing the job that we started to do 20 years ago. Then...

[Kuznetsov] Thirty years ago...

[Plekhanov] Thirty years, well, we stopped doing it 20 years ago. But why is it important? Because there can be two views of the socialism that we have now. Is this the only kind, and the right kind of socialism that we have? Or is it a deficient model of socialism which can and must be improved, replaced with another model? And I happen to hold the second view. While people who consider Stalin the greatest leader of all times, and the very, very great Communist, they, they seem to believe that the system that was created at the time of Stalin is the only kind of system, is the only kind of socialism one can think of. I think that the history has shown that that old system has outlived its use. I mean, it was a tragedy that it had such features, but history is tragic. Especially the history of Russia is full of tragic episodes. But we have lived through that episode, we are in a new stage, and we must build a new socialism, democratic socialism, a socialism which truly embodies the ideals for which people fought and died in the 1917, in the civil war, in the Great Patriotic War, in the Second World War. So that, those ideals and those, that model of socialism, is still in our imagination, still in our mind and we must build it. But that involves breaking with some of the horrible practices which we inherited from the times of Stalin, and which were revived in some sort or another during the stagnation period in the 1970's.

[Kuznetsov] Er, I think that currently, we are comparing two models, two types of socialist system. The one that was created during the thirties by Stalin is now called in our mass media state or bureaucratic socialism, as opposed to people's socialism...

[Plekhanov] ...or democratic socialism.

[Kuznetsov] ...or democratic socialism as was envisaged by Lenin, by Vladimir Lenin, the founder of our state. And I think that another very important point in the current debate is that we are searching for roots in those times when Lenin was alive after the revolution, and his plans for the economic development of Russia that were curtailed by Stalin, that were destroyed by Stalin, and as you said, er...

[Bogdanov] By the system created by him.

[Plekhanov] Yes. Take collectivization or plans to industrialize, to turn our country into an industrialized nation. Lenin also wanted that but he had different plans to achieve that.

[Bogdanov] Of course, Lenin's roots are very, very, if you like, productive, productive. They, they, they are very human, that's why they matter very much; they are very human. But I'm afraid the time has changed so much, even in the technological, you know, way that we cannot pick up all that belongs to the twenties and to bring it to date. [That] would be a little bit artificial. What we are talking about? We are talking about principles...

[Kuznetsov] Guidelines.

[Bogdanov] ...guidelines of socialism.

[Kuznetsov] Right, values, values.

[Bogdanov] ...and for values, exactly, values. And what is the most important value for me is the human factor in all that. Lenin's socialism was built on [the] human factor, and I believe that now when we say that what is good for people, this is real socialism, that is exactly Lenin's idea. After all, any revolution is made not for somebody's glory but for people, and of course, you have only Lenin's ideas, Lenin's guidelines, not details of, [word indistinct] we cannot come back to the new economical [indistinct interruption] No, no, no. But what is important in all that? Lenin's cooperative idea of socialism. Socialism, agriculture, viewed on cooperative base. That's what is important. You can have different details, you can have different shapes, but the idea is there. That's what I...

[Kuznetsov] The 19th Communist Party Conference that's going to take place late in June is going to be a milestone event for us, for the country, because it will work out the guidelines and perhaps set the direction, set the course for the country to follow for many years to come and perhaps decades to come. And one of the crucial issues will be defining the role of the party in that process. I think you would agree with that. Now, how helpful could the current debate be, a mere two months before the party conference?



[Plekhanov] I think it energizes the party. It forces every member of the Communist Party to define his attitude to perestroika, and I'm convinced that within the party, just as within the country at large, the overwhelming majority reject the ideas put forward in that ill-fated article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. Because we, er, you know a good thing when you see it, and perestroika is a good thing. It's a difficult struggle, it is, it involves a lot of work and there will be frustration and so on, but it's clear to everyone that this is the thing to do now. This is the only way out. There is no alternative. By the way, the arguments of the conservatives demonstrate very clearly that there is no alternative because they don't have a good case against perestroika. Their case is rotten. It's rotten! They don't have a good argument.

[Bogdanov] Exactly! (?The more, the more) you know about Stalin's crimes and the Stalin period, the more you become convinced that this is a rotten, rotten period that we should never come back.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, that you should run fast away from it!

[Bogdanov] Yeah, run fast away from it.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, but you know, these people seem to have a point when they refer to patriotic sentiments, to patriotic feelings. Aren't we destroying our history? Aren't we destroying ourselves? Aren't we involved in some kind of mud-slinging?

[Plekhanov] Well, no, I mean this is, this is an absolutely unacceptable idea because what we are talking about, is it patriotic to sort of, well to forgive those people who were torturing in the, in the prisons, those people who made the revolution with Lenin? Or, or maybe it's more moral and more patriotic to recall the sufferings of those who were tortured, those patriots, real patriots who made the revolution. But what the conservatives are asking us for now is, well you know, forgive them, don't talk about that, don't talk about that. But I think that one has to make the choice between the victims and the torturer.

[Kuznetsov] They also cite the economic achievements of the past, and I don't think...

[Plekhanov] The economic achievements, the economic achievements are another thing. The fact that we in a very short time, that we built up an economy that was able to withstand a terrible onslaught from Germany in the Second World War, it's a tribute not to Stalin, it's a tribute to those working people who created that potential, the engine, and by the way many of them were slaughtered by Stalin.

[Kuznetsov] Er, my final question because we are, as time is running out on us and we have to conclude this program, er, I think that one of the best ways to define, to describe perestroika is that it is movement to (?er) common sense. There is no ideology in this definition, but I think...

[Bogdanov] Pavel. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Don't you think that ideology, good ideology and common sense is all the same? All the same [chuckles] bad ideology opposing the common sense is not common sense. I'm sorry.

[Plekhanov] I agree with that. The good ideology is always in line, in tune with common sense. It's the same thing.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you very much Drs Bogdanov and Plekhanov. I think we'll be discussing preparations for the 19th party congress in our future "Top Priority" shows. This is a very, a very important event that will take place in the second half of June. And on this note, I'm your host Pavel Kuznetsov signing off, thanking all of you for being with us, and good-bye till next week at the same time and on the same wavelength.

**'Russian Culture' Conference Aims Questioned**  
PM291143 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in  
Russia 28 Apr 88 p 4

[I. Kochetkov and L. Yevseyeva article: "The 'Confessional' Fog. When It Disperses, the True Essence of the 'Champions' of National Spirit Becomes Visible"]

[Text] It has been decided to transform the Andrey Rublev Museum into the Central Museum of Ancient Russian Culture and Art. This fact is pleasing in itself—the institution's status will be enhanced, and it will gain broader scope for work.

It was decided to organize a scientific conference on "Methodological Problems of the Continuity of Tradition in Russian Culture" in order to elaborate a comprehensive research program. Eminent scientists and specialists were invited to attend.

People expected an academic style of reports and accuracy of methodological directives. But then Candidate of Philosophical Sciences L. Bystrov, the very first speaker at the seminar on Russian culture under the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, mounted the rostrum and immediately stunned the public with the scientific nature of his formulations. Here are some of them: "Holiness is a biochemical reality;" "The imperishability of relics is a consequence of psychotechnology;" or "Contemporary knowledge (referring to research done by the Paris Metapsychic Institute) does not doubt the

imperishability of relics." Following the October Revolution, the speaker waxed indignant; there was a "villainous campaign to destroy holy relics"—"Russia's spiritual generators" (the unnamed villains were obviously much more perspicacious than the Paris metapsychologists).

Some people (villains and antipatriots?), Bystrov went on, had tucked away the article on "Russia" in the Brockhaus and Yefron Encyclopedic Dictionary behind the entry for ciliary insects so that nobody could find it. Those same people had also consigned to total oblivion Berezin's wonderful "Russian Encyclopedia," and L. Bystrov now cannot make even librarians understand what he is talking about. (Let us explain: The esteemed champion of all things Russian has confused the "Russian Encyclopedia" edited by S.A. Adrianov and others and published in 1911-1915 with I.N. Berezin's "Russian Encyclopedic Dictionary" published in 1873-1879. If the speaker had, so to speak, dug a little deeper, he would have discovered that the dictionary did not shine with any special merits even at the time when it first appeared. Its entries—with certain individual exceptions, of course—were rather clumsy compilations, while hardly any of the facts, dates, and figures cited in them were distinguished by the necessary accuracy and veracity. Furthermore, many entries in the dictionary clearly reflected the reactionary sociopolitical views of its chief editor, who hastened to express them at the slightest suitable opportunity. Many entries in the "Russian Dictionary" are translations from foreign reference books done, according to the famous publicist P.L. Lavrov, "by people who were not familiar with either the language or the topic.")

But who are those villains who cannot stand anything Russian? Have you not guessed yet? The very same ones who have crammed scientific literature on Russian culture full of "recurrent proto-Zionist views."

The speaker boldly named just one of them—A.Ya. Garkavi (1835-1919), one of the founders of the study of oriental sources on the history of Russia's peoples. What effect did Zionism have on this scientist's works? It appears that, in his work "Russia and the Russians in Medieval Jewish Literature," he mentioned in passing that: "It is well known that 'The Sermon of Luka Zhidyata' is the hitherto first-known work of Russian literature." (Let us explain: Luka Zhidyata was the second bishop of Novgorod and the first local resident to become bishop. Some scientists consider him to have been a baptized Jew, while others consider him to have been a Slav.) This trivial inaccuracy (it would be more accurate to say "one of the first") was enough to enable L. Bystrov to discover an entire "proto-Zionist" trend in Russian historiography. "After all, Garkavi was a Karaite" [member of a Jewish sect rejecting the Talmud]—that was the next argument used by the speaker....

Asked to cite some more convincing examples of proto-Zionist views, the speaker admitted that he could not recall the name of a single Zionist, but he did promise to bring along a full list the next day. Alas, Bystrov did not appear on the second day of the conference.

The subject taken up by another speaker—N.A. Benediktov, another candidate of philosophical sciences—was equally "academic." Mounting the rostrum, he announced it: "On Orthodoxy and Leninism!" He went on to proclaim that Orthodoxy in its Byzantine form and Marxism are equally alien to the Russian national awareness. Vladimir Svyatoslavovich, who baptized Russia, even fought Byzantium to uphold his perception of Orthodoxy. Initially, Marxism also "took the form of Russophobia." True enough, Marx later did change his views on Russia. And Lenin, being a genuine Russian whose favorite poet was Tyutchev, adapted Marxism to the Russian spirit to produce Leninism.

So, what was the Russian version of Orthodoxy for which Prince Vladimir fought and which is never mentioned in scientific literature, including the Russian Church historians? Why is it that Marx' "Russophobia" makes Marxism alien to the Russian national awareness? Why is it that the speaker describes the slavophiles, and also V. Solovyev and P. Florenskiy, as "specifically Russian philosophers" and apparently denies the "Russianness" of Herzen, who was a revolutionary democrat and a Marxist?

Perplexity was certainly caused by the speaker's following assertion: "Russia was the only country with universal literacy." What does this mean? Was the cultural revolution unnecessary?

There was an intriguing sound to the topic taken up by Ye.N. Shatalin, a third candidate of philosophical sciences: "Continuity of Tradition in the Study of the Soul in Russian Culture." The speaker called for the preservation of the idea of "soul," whose absence distorts our mental world. This idea has been expelled from our life; it has been replaced by the idea of "spirit," but the two ideas are not identical. For example, Hitler and Stalin undoubtedly had "spirit," but they had no "soul."

He needed this introduction in order to launch into a conversation about "soulless" bourgeois humanism under which man took the place of god, lost his soul, and consequently moved to fascism. He went on: "There is no movement toward holiness in the West." Meanwhile, the Russian popular awareness is free of bourgeois attitudes. Hence, the speaker announced, philosophical thinking knows of two ways to overcome bourgeois humanism: Marxism, and V. Solovyev's teaching. If the block of V. Solovyev's teaching strikes against the block of Marxism, the resulting spark will illumine the path into the future.

The views expressed by the philosopher-speakers displayed an amazing unity. They all deliberated on the Russian soul or spirit, contrasted Russian history and European culture, and tended to attribute many of our misfortunes to Zionist intrigues. All this was further spiced with faith in the supernatural. The speakers did not adduce any proof of their stipulations: They proclaimed them.

We would have found it hard to give a name to this trend in contemporary philosophy had it not been for the help provided by one of the speakers. L. Bystrov expressed regret that we lack a "confessional culture," which he defined as "secular knowledge based on certain religious postulates." It seems to us that L. Bystrov does not quite do justice to himself or to his colleagues. We think that they successfully fill the gap which has developed by creating, if not a "confessional culture," then at least a "confessional philosophy." Frankly speaking, their ideas and even their manner of behavior have much in common with the "Pamyat" ideologists.

There was talk about a conference under the auspices of the philosophical (methodological) seminar on Russian culture under the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium. We must admit, it seems strange to us that a seminar described as "methodological" should present such a strange methodology of research.

There can be no argument that the study of the history of Russian culture is one of the methods for acquiring national self-knowledge, without which a nation cannot find the correct path in the contemporary world. We are far from suggesting that representatives of "confessional philosophy" be deprived of the freedom of speech. On the contrary! They must be allowed to express themselves freely and fully because without that, any discussion would be impossible. As a matter of fact, now they would be wrong to complain about their position. They have their own seminar under a highly authoritative institution, and they have acquired their own tribune: the Andrey Rublev Central Museum of Ancient Russian Culture and Art.

Conference Chairmen E.F. Volodin and Candidate of Philosophical Sciences O.Ye. Pavlovskaya, the museum's deputy director for scientific work, announced that all reports will be printed without any restrictions on length. This will enable the participants in the methodological seminar to voice their ideas fully and frankly, and their opponents to join in the polemics with texts in their hands. But are the tenets of "confessional philosophy" likely to provide the ideological basis for the museum's future activity?

Alas, the stance taken by the philosophers who addressed the conference gives no hope for tolerance toward opponents. Surely, this would damage the enlightening and educational work of the Central Museum, whose purpose is to satisfy our society's needs for knowledge of Russian medieval culture?

Half-truths and forgeries, a thick fog of pseudoscientific theories, and speculation with interest in the spiritual values of the past are all an insult to that past. The museum is hardly likely to perform its lofty purpose by taking the positions of "confessional philosophy."

### Economic

**Council of Ministers Views 1st Quarter Results**  
*PM290911 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 1,3*

[TASS report: "At the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] At a routine session on 25 April the USSR Council of Ministers considered the following questions:

On the results of the fulfillment of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in the first quarter of 1988;

On the state of wholesale trade in the national economy and the prospects for its development in light of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum decisions.

Reports were delivered on the first item by USSR Gosplan Chairman Yu.D. Maslyukov and USSR Finance Minister B.I. Gostev.

They noted that, as a result of working people's creative activity promoted by the preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference under way all over the country, the entry into effect of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association), collectives' increased independence, and the extensive introduction of economic accountability, there were definite positive changes in the country's socioeconomic development in the first quarter. The rate of increase in industrial output compared with the first quarter of 1987 was 5 percent against the 4.5 percent estimated in the plan for 1988, and the whole increase was due to improved labor productivity. Pledges based on contracts concluded were fulfilled by 99.2 percent compared with 97.8 percent in the first quarter last year. Sectors of the fuel-power and metallurgical complexes did steady work. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes increased sales of livestock and poultry to the state by 3 percent and sales of milk and eggs by 6 percent. Positive results were achieved in the work of transport and the construction complex.

There was a marked increase in the commissioning of facilities in the sociocultural sphere: 12.9 million square meters of housing was commissioned, which is 5 percent more than in the 1st quarter of 1987; 37 percent more preschool establishments, 39 percent more schools, 110 percent more hospitals, 30 percent more clubs and cultural centers, and 72 percent more vocational and technical schools were handed over.



But the reports and speeches by session participants concentrated on how to improve the state of affairs in those areas which are lagging behind at the moment and are hindering general movement along the road of restructuring. A principled, businesslike discussion took place.

The keenest discussion concerned the problem of the country's food supplies. In a number of republics, krais, and oblasts there has been no improvement in supplies of such products as meat, vegetables, and fruit, and this is promoting just complaints from the population. But local bodies are not adopting effective measures to improve the regions' own food supplies. Union management bodies are also responsible for serious shortcomings in this matter.

Attempts by the chairmen of the Ukrainian SSR, Moldavian SSR, and Georgian SSR Councils of Ministers to blame the fall in meat production in those republics on objective factors were not supported by session participants. There was also sharp criticism of the work of the relevant union and republican bodies. In particular, it was noted that the USSR Gosagroprom, the USSR Ministry of Grain Products, the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry, the USSR Ministry of Trade, and Tsentrsoyuz are making extremely heavy weather of work restructuring and that the mighty potential of the agro-industrial complex is not yet being fully exploited.

A decision adopted by the USSR Council of Ministers takes into account proposals by the USSR Gosagroprom and union republics' Councils of Ministers. They outline measures to ensure the fulfillment and overfulfillment of annual plans for the production of meat and dairy products, baby and dietary food, confectionery, and a number of other goods, the improvement and considerably more thorough processing of all procured products, and the improvement of the quality of food products. It is important now that all the plans should be put into practice. But there are many examples of poor organizational work. The Council of Ministers, for example, has noted on several occasions the serious shortcomings in the development of the production of hothouse and early vegetables. But time is passing and the problems are slow to be resolved. The attention of the USSR Gosagroprom and union republics' Councils of Ministers was drawn to this obviously abnormal situation.

The USSR Government members who participated in the preparation of materials for the USSR Council of Ministers session reported that the potential for an increase in the production of fish products, pasta, confectionery, and groats, larger procurements of potatoes, fruit, and berries, and a general improvement of trade in these products is still not being exploited. Union republics' Councils of Ministers, the USSR Gosagroprom, the USSR Ministry of Trade, the USSR Ministry of Grain Products, the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry, and Tsentrsoyuz were told to examine these questions in conjunction with local soviet ispolkoms in every region,

republic, oblast, and rayon and do everything necessary to rectify the situation. If necessary the most important proposals are to be submitted for discussion by soviets.

Addressing the session, P.D. Kondrashov, USSR first deputy minister of trade, and A.G. Yashin, first deputy chairman of the Tsentrsoyuz Board, said that the failure to meet the demand for many consumer goods in full is creating serious difficulties in terms of normalizing the money supply in the country and is causing an imbalance between the people's growing incomes and their expenditure.

According to USSR State Committee for Statistics data, in the 1st quarter alone trade failed to receive food and nonfood goods worth R1.2 billion. In particular, light industry enterprises failed to deliver goods worth a total of around R0.2 billion. Enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, and the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry failed to fulfill the plan for the delivery of lumber, sanitary engineering equipment, wallpaper, paint and varnish, and electrical equipment.

In this connection the USSR Government listened to reports by USSR ministers V.G. Klyuyev, M.I. Busygin, and O.G. Anfimov. There was a principled assessment of the work of their ministries in ensuring the fulfillment of plans for the production of consumer goods at subsidiary enterprises. The USSR Council of Ministers made it incumbent on the leaders not only of these but of all the other ministries and departments and also permanent bodies of the USSR Council of Ministers and union republics' Councils of Ministers to really get down to rectifying the state of affairs. They must immediately examine questions connected with providing the populace with consumer goods. The 1988 targets for the production of these goods and for the development of consumer services must be fulfilled unswervingly.

In the matter of increasing consumer goods production and services, it was noted at the session, some ministries and departments underestimate the role of production sharing. In their speeches these ministries' representatives even tried to present arguments justifying this stance. But on careful consideration they were deemed invalid. The USSR Council of Ministers demanded of ministries and departments and union republics' Councils of Ministers the consistent implementation of the line of creating cooperatives for the production of consumer goods and provision of consumer services. It is time to finally remove the bureaucratic obstacles that are inhibiting the development of cooperatives. Everyone must appreciate that the correct way to fill the market with a variety of high-quality goods is to have a close alliance between cooperatives and the economy's state sector. It was also noted that the Council of Ministers had previously drawn attention to many of these shortcomings. But, as the 1st quarter results have demonstrated, they have still not been eliminated.

There was particularly close scrutiny and consideration of the causes of the lag in the machine building complex. An appendix to USSR Gosplan Chairman Yu.D. Maslyukov's report cites convincing evidence of the poor standard of production organization at many machine building enterprises. The assimilation and series production of equipment for the light, food, and other sectors of the processing industry are intolerably slow. This is having an adverse effect on the output of food and other consumer goods. If the machine builders fail to supply goods, the chain of stoppages gets longer. Ultimately all this affects Soviet people's prosperity. One-third of the enterprises in the machine building complex failed to fulfill contract commitments and consumers failed to receive goods worth R286 million. The state of affairs is no better in the chemical industry and timber processing complex, whose enterprises failed to supply products worth R269 million.

The results of the work of the USSR Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry, and the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum and Petrochemical Industry show that these ministries have failed to exploit the available potential for accelerating the sectors' development, have failed to take steps to give proper assistance to enterprises in the new management conditions, and are not paying enough attention to the exploitation of such long-term economic growth factors as the acceleration of scientific-technical progress, production intensification, and resource saving.

Serious complaints were also leveled at ministries in the construction complex. It was stressed that the USSR Ministry of Construction in the Urals and West Siberia Regions of the USSR and construction ministries in the Tajik SSR, Turkmen SSR, Armenian SSR, Georgian SSR, and Moldavian SSR are failing to satisfactorily implement the contract work plans laid down for them. Many projects scheduled for commissioning are significantly behind schedule, and the commissioning of production capacities has not been fully implemented. There were many complaints again about the quality of construction. Restructuring is not yet making an impression in the sectors of this complex and the economic mechanism has not been readjusted. So one is forced to introduce state acceptance. Where this has already taken place there have been changes for the better.

The shortcomings noted in the work of a number of sectors and complexes are seriously inhibiting efforts to increase production and improve the people's prosperity. The requisite rate of growth has not been achieved in terms of some very important overarching indicators envisaged by the plan and estimates for 1988. The national income and social labor productivity increased by only 4 percent against the plan rate of 6.6 percent.

The USSR Government accepted the conclusions set out in the reports by the USSR Gosplan chairman and the USSR minister of finance. One of the chief reasons for the present situation is the fact that USSR Council of Ministers' permanent bodies, ministries and departments, and union republics' Council of Ministers have not yet fully eradicated the command-and-administer style of leadership, have not appreciated that it is incompatible with the character of the current tasks, are slow to restructure, and are failing to create the requisite conditions for the democratization of production management and extensive introduction of full economic accountability and self-financing.

Attaching great significance to overcoming the lag in very important areas of the economy as quickly as possible, as it does, and to ensure that the economy develops in accordance with the rate envisaged by the 5-year plan, the USSR Government made it incumbent on permanent bodies of the USSR Council of Ministers and leaders of USSR ministries and departments and union republics' Councils of Ministers to implement specific measures to eliminate shortcomings and fundamentally change their organizational and economic activity.

Among the general range of questions, the USSR Government highlighted rural workers' current concerns. Specific targets were set for material and technical backup for spring field work.

The session listened to a report on the second item by USSR Gosnab Chairman L.A. Voronin. The speaker noted that the work experience of a large group of consumers switched in 1987-1988 to supply without allocations, quotas, or certificates confirmed the important advantages of wholesale trade compared with traditional forms of product supply and sales. When correctly organized, wholesale trade can ensure a rapid solution of questions of supply, regular deliveries of all requisite goods, and faster movement of working capital. Moreover, wholesale trade makes considerable material resources available by reducing consumer stocks. On 1 January 1987 around 10,000 enterprises and organizations in various sectors were switched to material and technical supplies through the wholesale trade. Over a period of a year products worth R10 billion were sold in that way. But, as the keynote speaker and other session participants noted, the development and scale of wholesale trade still fall short of the tasks of restructuring economic management.

Many facts were cited at the session demonstrating that the USSR Gosnab and the USSR Gosagroprom have been slow to develop work on organizing wholesale trade. The mechanism for conducting it has not been fully established yet and the forms and methods of studying real needs in terms of resources are not entirely clear. Sometimes they call it wholesale trade, but the name conceals an old meaning. Ministries are conducting the old policy, not bothered about organizing trade

but intent on not letting go of resources. There are also many shortcomings in the organization of centralized supplies of products to consumers from depots and stores. The poor material and technical base of supply and marketing bodies in the USSR Gosnab and USSR Gosagroprom system is still doing much to inhibit the development of wholesale trade.

During the discussion of the item it was established that many USSR ministries and departments and union republics' Councils of Ministers are clearly underestimating the significance of wholesale trade and in some cases are simply opposed to its development and are preventing the products they distribute from being put on free sale through stores or in accordance with contracts and nonquota consumer orders.

In its assessment of the development of wholesale trade in the means of production as a very important area of the fundamental restructuring of the material and technical provision of the national economy, the USSR Council of Ministers adopted as a basis the proposals put forward by the USSR Gosnab on its accelerated development in 1989-1990. After being finalized in line with the comments made at the session, these proposals will be submitted to the USSR Council of Ministers no later than 1 June 1988.

N.N. Slyunkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, and Yu.D. Maslyukov and N.V. Talyzin, candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, participated in the work of the USSR Council of Ministers session.

N.I. Ryzhkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Council of Ministers chairman, made a speech at the session.

**RSFSR Releases 1st Quarter Statistics**  
LD291504 Moscow TASS in English 1522 GMT  
29 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—The productivity of social labour in the Russian Federation—the largest of the Soviet Union's republics—went up by 4.4 percent in the first quarter of this year as compared with the corresponding period of last year, which ensured the entire increment in the national income produced, says a report of the State Committee of the Russian Federation for Statistics. The report was issued here today.

Industrial output rose by 4.7 percent, and labour productivity increment was 6.2 percent. The entire increase in output was ensured with an absolute reduction in personnel as a result of a rise of labour productivity. Profit increased.

In the first quarter, agricultural enterprises produced 2.8 million tons of meat in live weight, which was three percent more than in the corresponding period of last year, 8.7 million tons of milk (a four percent increase) and 9,500 million eggs (a seven percent increase).

Despite the increase in the sale of meat and dairy products, there was some strain in the provision of population with them. In a number of regions, there remained serious drawbacks in meeting people's demands for confectionaries, bakery products, and sugar.

Population's demand for clothes and footwear was not met as before. In trade, there was a deficit of some haberdashery, perfumery and cosmetic goods. The population experienced difficulties in buying timber and building materials.

The report of the State Committee of the Russian Federation for Statistics points out that the population received 25,000 million roubles worth of payments and benefits from the social consumption funds, which was 1,300 million roubles more than in the first quarter of last year.

Resultant of state capital investments (centralized ones and the funds of enterprises), houses with an aggregate area of 7.1 million square metres were turned over to occupancy, including 1.9 million square metres of housing resultant of funds of enterprises and organizations. The planned targets for the first quarter in the republic as a whole were exceeded.

The population of the Russian Federation was 146.8 million as of April 1, 1988.

**Aganbegyan Answers Callers' Questions on Reforms**  
PM281541 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 23 Apr 88 p 4

["Direct Line" phone-in with Academician A.G. Aganbegyan answering KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA readers' questions, moderated by G. Ivanov-Smolenskiy: "The Economy Must Be... an Economy"]

[Text] [Caller] Hello, Abel Gezevich. My name is Belev, I am a test driver...

[Aganbegyan] Good day, what can I do for you?

[Caller] Restructuring is in its 3d year. And so far, in my view, it has "affected" only ordinary workers. Meanwhile the bosses, the management component, remain economically unaffected. In the case of my enterprise, for instance, the boss, the shop foreman gets the same wages—R250-280—"rain or shine." While we, the workers, have to operate a piecework system. Every year we have our piece-rates reduced. That's restructuring for you...



[Aganbegyan] Under the Law on the State Enterprise, labor collectives have been invested with great rights. It is up to you to decide for yourselves how these new conditions will be specifically translated into reality at your shop or section, regarding every worker.

As for the review of piece-work rates, every specific case has, of course, to be looked into individually. However, the general principle that applies in our national economy is that rates can only be reviewed if production conditions change substantially.

[Caller] Technologically, our conditions have not changed. We take the car out for a drive and then we crawl underneath it and fix its faults.

[Aganbegyan] But you do have a labor collective council; you do have a trade union. The times have changed. Invite the managers who are changing your rates and let them tell you their reasons. It is necessary to learn to exercise your rights...

[Caller] Well, thank you. Good-bye.

[Aganbegyan] Good luck.

[Caller] Good day. Gladyshev, chairman of a public catering cooperative, calling. Our enterprise has been set up under the USSR State Committee for Foreign Tourism within the framework of the drama and cultural center attached to the Yermolova Theater. I have a number of questions about the taxation of cooperatives. Do you think it right that a second taxation system should be set up in our state?

[Aganbegyan] I agree with you that the taxation system needs improving. Although it must be noted that the income tax rate which applies in our country is the lowest in the world. At the same time, the same rate applies to a monthly wage of R300 and R1,000, which, I think, is not fair. And, I am sure, that if that kind of fossilized system has become established in our country, that is no reason the taxation of cooperatives should also be subordinated to it.

On the other hand, there is no reason, in my view, why earnings of, say, R300 in a cooperative should be subject to a different tax rate than the same wages earned elsewhere. However, all this will have to be gone into. At any rate, the tax system must be such that it stimulates the establishment of cooperatives, of which there are so far very few. Around 13,000 in such a vast country—that's a drop in the ocean. So far only around 150,000 people are working in the new cooperatives. In my opinion it should be at least several million.

[Caller] Another question. This is a very controversial, problematic issue, in my view. People are saying: There will be a great exodus of the labor force from state enterprises to cooperatives.

[Aganbegyan] I believe that so far this is an exaggeration. Even in the longer term I see nothing terrible in the development of competition between cooperatives and state organizations in the consumer sphere, public catering, or the production of consumer goods, for instance...

[Caller] Hello, serviceman Sergey Lastochkin speaking. Don't you think we conduct our trade with socialist countries without due regard for economic advantage? For instance, we sell oil below world prices, yet for certain goods we pay higher prices...

[Aganbegyan] I think you are exaggerating. We sell oil to the socialist countries at world market prices—worked out on a 5 year average, it is true. So at specific times they may appear lower, and at others higher. We purchase goods from socialist countries at contract prices which take account of world market prices.

[Caller] Viktor Grigoryevich Marchenko from Moscow Oblast's Kaliningrad calling. What do you, Abel Gezevich, think about the article by V. Selyunin "The Growth Rates as Weighed on the Consumption Scales" published in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 5 January? It called into question your views that a high rate of economic development can appreciably improve the people's living standards...

[Aganbegyan] If you are referring to the passage where V.I. Selyunin criticizes me, I must say that in general I consider it wrong to be offended by criticism and to invariably react negatively to it. Furthermore, I largely agree with that article. As you know, I make no secret of my views. V.I. Selyunin does indeed cite my words to the effect that it is necessary to step up the pace of our socioeconomic development. However, I say further on: "The pace is not the main thing. The main thing is the new quality of growth. The main feature of this new quality of growth is the intensification of the social orientation."

[Caller] What about the national economic proportions? After all, it is true that in our country there is a very substantial bias toward accumulation.

[Aganbegyan] You know, it seems to me that the author of that article describes many things as if nothing was being done in our country. But just take housing, for instance. Over the past 2 years we have achieved a great advance in housing construction for the first time in 20 years. In 1987 we built almost 130 million square meters of housing. Compared with some 100-110 million commissioned in previous years. That means that resources have been radically redistributed. Or take health care. Recently its budget was increased by R6 billion. That too represents a very real redistribution of resources in favor of improved well-being. What about education? R11 billion has already been spent on the school reform, and we are increasing capital investments for the construction of schools by 70 percent in the current 5-year period.

[Caller] My name is Viktor Grigoryevich Kravchenko. I work as chief of a Balashikha enterprise transport department. I have a problem. I would like to avoid wage leveling in the remuneration of drivers and repair mechanics. I would like people to have a stake in working as hard as possible and to the highest possible standard. But you see, there is no literature to be had anywhere of how to intelligently organize this.

[Aganbegyan] This is what I think you should do. The Glavmosavtotrans [Moscow City Main Administration for Motor Transport] has carried out experiments at a number of combines. They have accumulated experience in the organization of collective contracts. Get in touch with them, let them tell you. It seems to me that it is very dangerous to work out provisions like these single-handedly. It is necessary to enlist the support of the collective, to get together if not the whole collective then at least the best drivers and to consult them. Several heads are better than one and, you know, people themselves sometimes come up with the best solutions.

[Caller] Good day. Viktor Altunin, student at the Plekhanov Institute, speaking. What do you think will be done to expand the rights and opportunities of economists and their influence on the economic mechanism and restructuring. When will economists at last be assigned a worthy place in the management structure?

[Aganbegyan] That, of course, is a very crucial question. It seems to me that in the conditions of economic reform and restructuring the role of economists has now sharply increased. After all, I represent USSR Academy of Sciences economists. I can say that we do not feel ourselves to be at any disadvantage. The complaint that no one is listening to us or that we have no opportunity to express our views did apply in the past, but the situation has changed. The fact that we ourselves are not always up to the mark is another matter.

[Caller] Good day. This is Svetlana Garistova from Sofia. I am a journalist.

[Aganbegyan] Go ahead.

[Caller] In your view, is it possible to create more powerful stimuli for the assimilation of scientific and technical progress on a socialist basis than it is under capitalism?

[Aganbegyan] I believe this is not only possible but also necessary. Although this is probably the most difficult question in the restructuring of the management system. Above all it is necessary to ensure that the labor compensation and the entire social development of any labor collective which is working to promote scientific and technical progress—that is, the collective as a whole and each of its individual members—is made directly dependent on the efficiency of their work.

[Caller] Can you cite examples?

[Aganbegyan] If you like. The Paton Institute. The renowned "Kriogenmash" Association. Or the Ivanovo Heavy Machine Building Plant. However, so far we are making poor use of what Marx termed the additional production potential of collective labor. Take for instance the so-called KITS—intensive labor collectives in agriculture. In Novosibirsk Oblast, for instance, the annual output per worker in such collectives totals R100,000—110,000. That is eight times as much as the average for the country as a whole and higher than the average level achieved by U.S. farmers. All this is achieved using our ordinary agricultural machinery...

[Caller] Good day. I am calling from Alma-Ata. Niyara Balzanova, a student at the department of philosophy and economy. Could you tell me when the new textbook on the political economy of socialism will be published?

[Aganbegyan] The compilation of this textbook is currently drawing to a close. It is in the hands of a commission headed by our famous political economist V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the party Central Committee and corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences. I am also taking part in this work. In the near future sample copies of the textbook will be made available for examination by VUZ political economists. Sometime in May it is planned to hand over the book to the printers.

[Caller] Hello! Boris Vladimirovich Klinchenko, an economist, speaking. I have a question: Is a monetary reform likely in the near future?

[Aganbegyan] No. We are not planning to carry out a monetary reform. Monetary reforms are usually carried out during special, critical periods, during a war or soon afterward. To carry out a monetary reform in peacetime when nothing unusual is happening is, in my view, dangerous and even harmful. It would upset the whole society, undermine confidence in the ruble, and have other negative social consequences. I personally see the solution not in exchanging existing money for "new" money (which is the essence of a monetary reform) but in balancing supply and demand mainly through the stimulation of the production of consumer goods and a marked expansion of their range.

[Caller] Konstantin Totiyev calling. In connection with the cuts in the administrative apparatus reports have appeared in the press to the effect that administration staff laid off at one department are simply transferred to another. Naturally, as a result the total number of administrative apparatus staff does not change. I would like to hear your opinion on this subject.

[Aganbegyan] This is not true, since apparatus cuts are a measure which is being applied everywhere. In the case of ministries and departments the cuts in staffing total between 30 and 50 percent. It is not one department that is being cut but all of them—union and republic departments alike...

[Caller] Good day. Valentina Tikhonovna Shurygina, an economist from Kaliningrad in the Baltics, on the line...

[Aganbegyan] I am listening.

[Caller] I have the following question. Having to change jobs is always damaging to people's morale. Frequently it also involves a material loss. Do you not think that with massive cuts the damage will also be on massive scale?

[Aganbegyan] What can I say? First, not all job changes are the same. After all, many people try to find themselves suitable jobs even before they have been made redundant. As for those who do not succeed, there may, of course, initially be some damage to morale and even traumatic experiences; it is not pleasant to have to leave a familiar job.

[Caller] Furthermore, the expenditure for retraining may exceed all the expected gains?

[Aganbegyan] You must understand that in the case of apparatus cuts the results cannot be expressed in monetary terms alone. The main reason for the cuts is not to save wages, although that too is very important. The aim here is something much more important—to ensure a real expansion of the rights of enterprises and associations and to eliminate unnecessary administrative components which hamper their work.

[Caller] Nonetheless, are the substantial cuts not excessive?

[Aganbegyan] Excessive? The point is that we have allowed things to go too far. Of course, if we had set about rectifying this in good time, say in the late sixties, then we could have probably gotten by without taking such drastic steps. However, we cannot continue living the way we are.

[Caller] Hello. Nikolay Vladimirovich Vezelskiy, an engineer from Tula, on the line.

[Aganbegyan] Fire away.

[Caller] Currently there is much talk about paid medical services. I would like to tell you the opinion of those with whom I work, whom I know well. We are all against it. Not because of the money, but because it touches on the principles of socialism. Once there is no guarantee of free health care, it is no longer the same social system...

[Aganbegyan] Without any question the guarantee of free medical care will remain. As you know, the Constitution contains relevant articles to this effect. As for the paid services, they would be over and above the free state care, not instead. Let's say that you do not like the free service offered by your district doctor. Or you would like

to go to a specialist whom you know or who has been recommended to you. This specialist works during the day at a state establishment. In the evening he offers consultations for payment.

[Caller] I do not approve of this...

[Aganbegyan] So you don't approve, you are against this. But no one is forcing you to use this service. After all, and I repeat, it is not provided instead of the main, free service. Polyclinics providing paid stomatological services have been in operation for a long time and are considered useful.

[Caller] Hello! Aleksandr Khudyakov, a programmer from Leningrad, on the line. I would like to know your answer to the following question: What measures, in your view, are necessary to ensure the development of an information science industry in our country?

[Aganbegyan] The main decisions on this account have been adopted. Software is a commodity which must be bought and sold in our country just as it is in other countries. Only then will we achieve a great positive result.

[Caller] I agree with you. There is a multitude of problems which are causing us, the programmers, concern. For instance, left, right, and center we read in Western sources about developments which have originated in our country but which were not patented.

[Aganbegyan] I can tell you in this context that a new draft Law on Inventions has been drawn up in our country. As an economist I have been involved in this work to some extent. In the near future it will be published for discussion purposes. In my view it deals with the aforementioned questions relatively comprehensively. In general, however, you are quite right: We must patent our inventions, especially in the sphere of information technology, to break into the world market. The first swallows have appeared—the first joint enterprises are being set up in cooperation with other countries. Our foreign partners and their subcontractors are taking on the tasks of introducing our goods onto Western markets. Some programs of this kind will be produced by the joint company "Dialog" which comprises on our side the Kama Truck Plant, the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute, the Space Research Institute, and others.

[Caller] Good day! Aleksandr Zvonov from Minsk on the line.

[Aganbegyan] What can I do for you?

[Caller] In KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA there is a rubric "Komsomol and the Economy." What, as an economist, is your attitude toward this combination?



[Aganbegyan] My attitude is positive. This is because I believe the economy must increasingly pass into young hands. And in general, interest in the economy, in economic education, must gradually become a feature of modern thinking. I read KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA every day. My son has a subscription. It seems to me that it could publish even more economic materials. Although the rubric as such is good and useful.

[Caller] But we have gotten used to regarding the Komsomol as a political organization. Now suddenly the Komsomol committee is beginning to tackle economic problems, it is crawling into the economic "jungle." Is that its function?

[Aganbegyan] Everything depends on the focus, on the approach. Naturally, no political organization should supplant economic organs. That includes the Komsomol—it cannot, for instance, replace the planning or technological department. On the other hand, economic education, the backing of sensible economic initiatives, and the dissemination of progressive experience, which up to now have not been within young people's reach, are quite a different matter. Why not attend to this? You will recall, for instance, what was a purely Komsomol initiative—housing complexes for young people. I know something about the first complex in Sverdlovsk because I was invited to visit it. Therefore I can say with utmost responsibility that the fact that the Komsomol took this matter into its hands and submitted a relevant proposal to the party Central Committee produced good social and economic results.

[Caller] May I ask another question, please? I have two friends who have gone to work at Komsomol shock construction sites. One is working at Yamburg, the other at Yelabuga. There are many such construction sites. I would like to know your attitude toward these construction sites. Is there an economic need for them? After all, masses of people are enlisted for this purpose, yet when they get there they frequently find disorganization and mismanagement. I have been told about this by my friends...

[Aganbegyan] I believe the existence of Komsomol shock construction sites is justified. The fact that many of them are characterized by serious shortcomings is a different matter. Yet in principle, concerning the idea itself, there is an economic purpose—and a major one at that. After all, the art of leadership lies in the ability to focus attention on priority tasks, as Lenin put it, on those links of the chain which when gotten hold of make it possible to pull the whole chain through. Imagine, if the Yamburg construction project was a flop, the European part of the country would be left without an additional source of gas and to a considerable extent without heat. Yamburg today represents an additional source of fuel, and a most effective source at that. And, naturally, this project must be given priority in comparison with others.

I have lived 24 years in Siberia and have visited Yamburg five times. I have a good idea of what it is like. It is not easy to pass through this type of schooling, you know.

[Ivanov-Smolenskiy] Abel Gezevich, there is a tradition of asking a question on behalf of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA journalists during the "Direct Line" phone-in.

[Aganbegyan] Go ahead.

[Ivanov-Smolenskiy] To be specific, we have three questions but they are closely interconnected. Here is the first question: The "braking mechanism" as a phenomenon of our life is being assessed and analyzed in different ways. What, in your view, are the main components of this "mechanism"?

[Aganbegyan] The basis of the braking mechanism is the administrative system of management. Above all the following three elements of this system: rigid administratively imposed targets, a centralized system of material and technical supply, and strict regulation of the activities of enterprises and organizations. The command and decree form of management alienates people from both the labor itself and its results; it turns social property into all but no one's property and stops workers feeling themselves to be in charge.

This mechanism, this system which is personified by the people who implement it, refuses to capitulate without a battle—nor can it be expected to. Departmental interests, local interests, and the interests of individual groups of administrative apparatus workers come into play here. The attempt to thwart these interests, to devolve rights from the apparatus to enterprises, to take away rights from people who have gotten used to issuing orders and to pass them on to the basic production components is, of course, a tricky job. After all, if your rights are taken away it means your privileges are taken away, your role is becoming less important or even totally unnecessary. Naturally, those who are "affected" try to counter this.

[Ivanov-Smolenskiy] The second part of our joint question is this. Does the resistance produced by the "braking mechanism" correspond to your forecasts and expectations?

[Aganbegyan] This is a difficult question to answer because when the restructuring began I made no predictions as to what resistance there would be. So there is nothing with which to compare it. But giving it some thought now, I did expect that things would go more smoothly, I did expect better results.

Five sectors switched to the system of economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing in 1987. In the past when we implemented progressive economic measures we always obtained an explosive economic effect. Take the 1965 reform, for instance: Growth rates tripled.

and production increased by 50-100 percent, and so forth. The acceleration and improvement of qualitative indicators were clearly noticeable. This time, during the switch of the first batch of enterprises to the new conditions, nothing comparable happened.

Why? Because administrative methods have remained, because they still predominate. The braking mechanism has not even been undermined; it rules. It rules because the forces which operate the braking mechanism have succeeded in filling the new forms—the state orders and economic normatives—with the old content. In practical terms the state order is a new term which serves as a cover for the former disgraced imposed target, the plan imposed from above. The state orders have smothered enterprises; the role of the departments has not only not diminished it has increased still further insofar as the state order invests administrative authorities with even greater powers. In the past centralization was focused more on the Gosplan. Now the ministries themselves have been authorized to define economic normatives. They have done so by clipping the wings of enterprises which were functioning well.

[Ivanov-Smolenskiy] And the last question, Abel Gezevich. I hope you will not think it rude. But, as an economist, you yourself take part today in the drafting and preparation of management decisions and strategic avenues of national economic management. Do you not feel that up to a point you too are part of the "braking mechanism"? After all, it would be naive to take the view that it ends at a specific level defined once and for all. And if you do feel this, could you tell us in what form and to what extent?

[Aganbegyan] Frankly speaking, I do feel this. I feel this because we are all children of our time. It is only natural that this time has left its mark on us: All of us have been to varying degrees subjected to dogmas, inertia, indecision. For instance, I have seen with my own eyes the establishment of unsubstantiated state orders and normatives which were far from truly economic. I opposed this approach. I argued that the state order cannot be turned into a "state command," that a normal plan is not an imposed target... But clearly I did not argue skillfully or convincingly enough, and most probably not vigorously enough. Thinking that somehow it would all turn out all right...

Well, we live and learn. It is necessary to act and proceed more firmly, consistently, without delays, without half-hearted decisions, and half-measures. In conditions of restructuring it is necessary to proceed openly. In this context I am waiting impatiently and with hope for the upcoming 19th All-Union Party Conference. I believe it will adopt decisions which will help to further accelerate restructuring and to involve new forces in it.

## Agricultural

**Nikonov Visits Kaluga Agro-Industrial Plant**  
*PM281105 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 88*  
*Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "Visit to Kaluga Oblast"]

[Text] On 26 April V.P. Nikonov, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, visited the Maloyaroslavetskiy experimental plant of the State All-Union Scientific Research Technological Institute for the Repair and Operation of the Vehicle and Tractor Fleet, where he saw examples of equipment, tools, instruments, and appliances for agricultural, processing, repair, and other enterprises and shops of the agro-industrial complex developed and manufactured at USSR Gosagroprom enterprises.

Particular attention was paid to the need to very rapidly master the production of a set of equipment for dressing sheepskin and manufacturing clothing and other items from it, chambers for the rapid freezing of fruit and berries, all-purpose metal-processing and metal-working machine tools, sets of equipment for teams of shepherds, small wind- and water-powered installations, and other units.

V.P. Nikonov was accompanied by G.I. Ulanov, first secretary of the Kaluga CPSU Obkom, and Yu.I. Mordvintsev, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agriculture and Food Industry Department.

**Warmer Weather Promotes USSR Crop Development**  
*PM271037 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian*  
*24 Apr 88 p 3*

[Agrometeorologist O. Pisarenko report: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Mild weather set in at the end of the 10-day period over most of the European USSR. In the regions located south of a line joining Riga, Kalinin, Vladimir, Ulyanovsk, Chelyabinsk, and Kurgan the maximum air temperature rose to 17-25° and on the remainder of the territory to 11-16°. The mild weather prompted vegetation in perennial sown grasses in the Northwest Region, the northern Baltic, Central, and Volga Regions and in the southern half of the Volga-Vyatka and Urals Regions. In the majority of these regions there were no noticeable signs of growth in the young grass shoots, and they were 1-3 cm high. In Lithuania, Latvia, Belorussia, the western and northern areas of the Ukraine, in the greater part of the Central, Central Chernozem and Volga Regions, the height of the sown cereal grasses, and also clover and alfalfa was 2-8 cm and in the south and southeast of the Ukraine and the North Caucasus it was 12-18 cm, and in places 20-25 cm.

The boundary of bud swelling in fruit crops by the end of the 10-day period had moved northward to a line joining Leningrad, Kalinin, Gorkiy, and Kazan. In the southern oblasts of Belorussia, in the northern and central regions of the Ukraine, and in the south of the Central Chernozem Region apple, cherry, and plum trees are budding. In the southern regions of the Ukraine and Moldavia peach and apricot trees are in flower.

In most of the republics of Central Asia and in the southern areas of Kazakhstan it grew warm and for most of the 10-day period stayed unusually warm and predominantly dry. The average air temperature exceeded the perennial average by 3-5°. The maximum temperature rose to 28-35°. The thorough warming of the soil (17-20° at a depth of 10 cm) and sufficient moisture content assisted seed germination and the appearance of shoots. In the south of Turkmenia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, and in places in the Fergana Valley cotton shoots appeared on crops at the end of March and the first half of April close to the usual time. In the republics of Central Asia and in the southern oblasts of Kazakhstan the growth of stalks on winter wheat and barley continued, and in the south of Turkmenia the plants formed ears. The growth of grasses continued. The height of alfalfa increased by 3-7 cm and south of a line joining Bukhara, Gulistan, and Andizhan it was 40-60 cm, and in places 61-65 cm. In the more northern regions, depending on the period when growth restarted, the height of the plants varied between 6 and 25 cm.

In the Transcaucasus republics warm weather predominated. The average air temperature exceeded the perennial average by 2-5°. The maximum air temperature increased to 23-28°, and in Armenia to 16-24°. In Azerbaijan the sowing of cotton continued. Conditions for seed germination were good.

#### Media Report 23-30 Apr Agricultural Developments

LD012327 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 23-30 April. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

23 April

The sowing of early spring crops has been completed in Kursk Oblast. The crops occupy an area of 600,000 hectares. (2300)

24 April

The farmers of Belorussia have started spring field work on the second half of the land. Most of the farms in the southwestern rayons have completed the sowing of early cereals. Many collective and state farms have started to plant potatoes. (1500)

25 April

No fileworthy items monitored.

26 April

Sowing of early spring crops has been completed on the Don. Barley shoots and winter wheat have appeared. Spring top-dressing has been carried out. (1100)

The (Pakutiya) agro-industrial association has been set up in Ivanovo-Frankovsk Oblast, including 13 collective farms, 3 state farms, and various enterprises and services. (1100)

27 April

In the southern regions many farms have almost finished sowing and work is coming to an end in the east. In Tomsk Oblast the farm machine operators have started tilling the soil, top-dressing pastures, and sowing perennial grasses. Farms here are provided with seeds and the machines have been repaired.

Farmers in the Altay are completing the last preparations for sowing. In a number of farms here hybrid seeds of maize received from Hungary will be sown. This is a quick-ripening variety that will allow more than 600 centners of green material per hectare to be obtained in the conditions of the Kulundinskaya steppe.

The farms of the Caspian lowland started sowing maize today. (1100)

Spring works are continuing around the country. Cotton sowing ended in Ashkhabad Oblast. Potato planting began in Maritime Kray. (Moscow TV 1430)

28 April

The USSR Goskomstat has reported that by 18 April more than 17 million hectares had been sown to spring crops. Sowing is expanding on fields devoted to maize, beet, vegetables, potatoes, and cotton. Farmers are also sowing other crops. In the south of the country, where grasses have ripened, their harvesting has started. (0300)

The first cotton shoots have appeared on the front-ranking farms of Pyandzh and Kolkhozabad Rayons in Tajikistan. In the republic the area sown to cotton has been cut by 10,000 hectares this year. (0400)

29 April

No fileworthy items monitored.

30 April

The sowing of wheat has begun in Kurgan Oblast. (0400)



### Scientific

**Soviet-Afghan Space Crew Holds News Conference**  
*LD291905 Moscow Television Service in Russian*  
*1430 GMT 29 Apr 88*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The cosmonauts who will form an international Soviet-Afghan space crew met with journalists today in Zvezdnyy Gorodok.

[Correspondent S. Slipchenko, identified by caption] This flight will have many unusual features. The first one is that the crews will each include a commander, a doctor, and a research cosmonaut from the Republic of Afghanistan. Everybody noticed that the crews do not include flight engineers. Their functions will be fulfilled by the doctor and researcher; on the other hand, both commanders have undergone training as rescue cosmonauts, which implies that a commander can be launched on his own to help return his two comrades back to earth from orbit, if necessary.

So, who will become crew members? They are Commander Vladimir Lyakhov, Second in Command Anatoliy Berezovoy, Doctors Valeriy Polyakov and German Arzamazov, and Research Cosmonauts Colonel Muhammad Dawran Gholam-Hasan and Captain Muhammad 'Abdul Ahad, representative of the Republic of Afghanistan. Both journalists and viewers know the commanders well. They both have taken part in long-term missions and in visit missions, and they are experienced cosmonauts. Doctors Valeriy Polyakov and German Arzamazov graduated from the Sechenov First Medical Institute. They are candidates of medical sciences and not only have graduated in general space training but also have learned the systems of the Mir station in detail. After completing the Soviet-Afghan program, a doctor will continue his flight onboard the Mir station with Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov.

As the doctors put it, apart from carrying out their own medical program, they will try to relieve the station crew from everyday concerns and to give them time for scientific work. Both future Afghan cosmonauts are pilots and have been trained in our country. They both have been in the war.

[Begin recording] [Afghan Air Force Colonel Muhammad Dawran, identified by caption] This flight is of great importance for the development of our country's economy. One has to find out the location of mineral deposits and water reservoirs, which can be used for our country's irrigation and land reclamation.

[Slipchenko] In your opinion, will this flight be of any importance for your people's unity?

[Dawran] Yes, we hope that it will be a peace flight for our people because it is to be carried out at a time when the Geneva accords have been signed.

[Slipchenko] Do you know whether people at home are looking forward to your flight?

[Afghan Air Force Captain Muhammad 'Abdul Ahad, identified by caption] Yes, we know they are looking forward to it. We often receive our newspapers and we often read articles there about our flight, and sometimes they write a little about the tasks we will be facing during the flight. [end recording]

### Mission To Begin in Aug

*LD291410 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT*  
*29 Apr 88*

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Candidates for a joint Soviet-Afghan space mission were named for the first time in Zvyozdny Gorodok (Star City) near Moscow today.

One of the two Afghan pilots, Colonel Muhammad Dawran or Captain Muhammad 'Abdul Ahad, will work on board the orbital space complex Mir (Peace) together with the Soviet crew of the main expedition. He will have a chance to see his homeland from space.

The start has been scheduled for August this year. The programme of the international expedition envisages numerous scientific experiments. Special attention will be given to studying Afghan territory in the interests of the country's national economy.

Both candidates, before arriving at the Cosmonauts' Training Centre, were put through their paces by doctors. The Afghans are experienced pilots and competent specialists.

Dawran was born in 1954 in the Nejrab District, Kapsisa Province. Ahad, 29, was born in the village of Sarde, Gazni Province.

They are undergoing a full-time training envisaged for international crews. Although the period of training has been shortened, the volume of knowledge that both spacemen are to master remains the same.

They save time by increasing the intensity of studies. The Afghan pilots had learned some Russian before coming to the Soviet Union—this also helps a lot.

The Afghan aviators were represented at today's meeting with journalists by Soviet Cosmonaut Pavel Popovich. The following Soviet nationals are training with the Afghans: Cosmonauts Vladimir Lyakhov and Anatoliy Berezovoy, and physicians Valeriy Polyakov and German Arzamazov.

**Activities of 'Mir' Cosmonauts' Reported**  
*LD301356 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian*  
*0700 GMT 30 Apr 88*

[Text] No labor intensive operations or experiments, as per rule, are planned for the crew of the manned Mir complex for Saturdays. Today—to be more precise, before lunch—the cosmonauts are summing up the results of the past working week and are tidying up the accommodation of their orbital home. The second half of the day is allocated to rest. In the evening, in the communications sessions, Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov will answer a medical questionnaire. It includes 20 questions.

At the same time, according to instructions from the Mission Control Center, research on extra-atmospheric astronomy will be carried out. The crew is checking the work of the equipment only periodically.

A 3-day cycle of measuring the emission of an X-ray source, Lebed X-1, is drawing to an end today. This is a compact X-ray star. The research, which is carried out with the help of telescopes of the Kvant module, has second place as far as popularity is concerned, behind a unique supernova in the Great Magellanic Cloud. The Lebed X-1 is a highly irregular star as far as its X-ray brightness is concerned. The astrophysicists are not as yet absolutely clear about its nature. In order to list this heavenly body as a definite star, additional information is needed. This is coming to earth from aboard the manned Mir complex.

**Instruments for Mars Exploration Described**  
*LD020912 Moscow TASS in English 0834 GMT*  
*2 May 88*

[Text] Moscow May 2 TASS—Special instruments have been manufactured for a space vehicle, which is to go to Mars, by specialists of the Scientific Research Institute of Atomic Reactors, the newspaper IZVESTIYA reports today.

These are sources of highly intensive ionizing radiation. They will be part of the apparatus Alpha-X complex. It is being created by the Soviet side jointly with foreign scientific centres: The Max-Planck Institute of Physics and Astrophysics and the Otto Hann Chemistry Institute (FRG), the Chicago University (USA). Two interplanetary stations will be blasted towards Mars from the Baykonur Cosmodrome (USSR) in July this year. They will approach Phobus, the satellite of Mars, as near as 50 metres.

Television photography in colour will be made at that time. The laser ray with the light spot diameter being approximately one mm will cause explosive-like evaporation of the satellite's surface rock, and ionized atoms of

the substance, on reaching the space vehicle, will be analysed in a mass spectrometer. The unique equipment will bring to earth valuable information on the mysterious satellite.

Sets of sources have now been put into the equipment of the Alpha-X complex. The test has shown that the sources are reliable for operation in space conditions.

**International Conference on Space Held**  
*LD011257 Moscow TASS in English 1108 GMT*  
*1 May 88*

[Text] New York May 1 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Kirilo reports:

The task of preparing and planning the Space International Year brought together zones of scientists from various countries, including the USA, the USSR and China, at the University of New Hampshire States [as received] in the city of Durham.

Though this unique event will take place only in 1992, participants in the three-day conference sponsored by the U.S. International Space Year Association are already now busied with specific discussion of several joint projects which are supposed to be timed to the 500th anniversary of discovering America by Christopher Columbus.

They include the use of satellites for explorations of such global problems as acid rains, a decrease in the ozone layer of our planet, as well as a noticeable and gradual warming of the earth's climate. The programme of the International Space Year also provides for shooting and showing special documentaries and broadcasts, organization of exhibitions and fairs.

Greeting conference participants, James Fletcher, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), said that the International Space Year would make it possible to bring together universal themes which had inspired human spirit in the past and continued to indicate peoples the way to boundless horizons of the future. A glance at the earth from outer space helps perceive how fragile and precious life is on the earth, the only planet of the solar system where it exists.

**Cosmonaut Attends 'Space Exploration Week'**  
*LD021124 Moscow TASS International Service*  
*in Russian 0650 GMT 2 May 88*

[Text] New York, 2 May (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vladimir Kikilo reports:

A "Space Exploration Week" has been held at the university of the U.S. city of Minneapolis, in Minnesota. The university has more than 50,000 students. It was

organized by the organization: "Students [words indistinct]" With Active Support from the Professors, the Teachers, and the Administration.

Pilot-Cosmonaut of the USSR Aleksandr Ivanchenko and the American Astronaut Brewster Shaw, together with scientists and specialists from the United States, the FRG, Japan, and Italy were the first visitors to the enthusiasts.

Very considerable experience of prolonged stays in space has been built up in the Soviet Union, Aleksandr Ivanchenko told the TASS correspondent at the end of the conference. We also have experience of carrying out assembly work in orbit, which is extremely important for the preparation of flights to other planets. By the year 2000, we hope to carry out a flight using an automatic station to the mysterious Red Planet, which would bring back to earth specimens of the Martian soil. Nor is a manned flight to Mars at the start of the next century beyond us. We have, however, put forward the idea of a joint expedition to Mars, in which not just the two main space powers, but other countries, too, would take part. This is preferable not only from the purely economic point of view but also in the interests of developing international cooperation and of space science, and of keeping space peaceful and safe.

### Military

**Yazov Briefs Diplomatic Missions on Doctrine**  
*PM020953 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian*  
30 Apr 1988 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the headline "For the Sake of Peace and Security"]

[Text] General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR defense minister, met in Moscow on April 29 with the heads of foreign diplomatic missions and military attaches at the embassies in the USSR.

In his statement, Gen Yazov set out the current Soviet military doctrine.

The very fact of the meeting, he observed, reflected new approaches to all-around cooperation that characterized the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

We hope it will promote better understanding and strengthening of confidence between our countries with a view to safeguarding universal security and peace.

The Soviet Union's international policy rests on new political thinking based on the concept of inadmissibility of war. In its fuller form, it is reflected in the concept of a comprehensive system of international security that gains growing recognition in the international community.

In relations between states with different social systems, our policy is that confrontation and an unrestricted arms race be replaced with stronger trust and mutual understanding, so that cooperation between nations broaden while their arsenals are cut.

The new political thinking, which proceeds from the all-around appraisal of the present-day realities, the existence of huge arsenals of weapons and the threat of their use, urgently demands that outdated views on problems of national and international security be discarded, the dogmas of "nuclear deterrence" be dropped and reciprocal suspicion and mistrust that have been accumulating for many decades be eradicated.

The practical implementation of new political thinking is exerting substantial influence on the shaping of the military doctrine of states or their coalitions. It demands both revision of the very notion of this important military-political category and the specification of its content.

In the past, the military doctrine was regarded as a system of views on the preparation and waging of a possible war. This interpretation and understanding no longer meet the present-day realities. War as a means of attaining political objectives has become unacceptable.

At the same time, the need for concern about security is dictated by the fact that many contradictions between states with different social systems which possess formidable armed forces remain unresolved, that attempts are made time and again to resolve complex international problems by force and that the arms race around the world is still continuing.

Taking this into account, the Political Consultative Committee adopted at the Berlin meeting in May 1987 a document "On the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty Member States", a defensive doctrine of which the Soviet Military doctrine is part. It is being thoroughly studied by political figures, ideologists and military experts in the West.

Some of them do not abandon attempts at distorting the essence of our doctrine and at imputing an offensive and even aggressive character to it. Others recognize the defensive character of the Soviet military doctrine but only with reference to its political part. As far as the military-and-technical field is concerned, they allege that it still characterizes our doctrine as an offensive one.

One should say that neither the one, nor the other assessment reflects the real essence of the Soviet military doctrine. Consequently, such an assessment does not promote mutual understanding, or a search for ways to reduce the existing tension, to achieve disarmament and to build up confidence.



Then the minister of defense described the character and content of the Soviet military doctrine, and showed that it is aimed at preventing war and at ensuring universal and reliable peace.

The socioeconomic system of the Soviet Union—socialism and a peaceful policy being pursued by it—is the basis of the Soviet military doctrine, he said. The Soviet Union has never associated and does not associate its future with a military solution to international problems, and unreservedly rejects war as a means for resolving inter-state contradictions. In our society, there are no forces, classes, sections or groups of population interested in war.

The main content and character of our military doctrine are determined by the priority goal of the Soviet foreign policy: to enable our people to work under conditions of lasting peace and freedom. This is reflected in the respective provisions of the party and state documents—the program of the CPSU, the decisions of the 27th party congress, the USSR Constitution, and other legislative acts as well as in the orders of the top military leadership, and is being implemented strictly in accordance with them.

The contemporary Soviet military doctrine is a system of officially accepted and basic views on the prevention of war, military development, the preparedness of the state and of its armed forces to repulse an aggression, and on ways of conducting an armed struggle in defense of the socialist state.

It follows already from the very definition of our doctrine that it is aimed at preventing war, and not at preparing for it, at strengthening international security, and not at unleashing wars. Naturally, it envisages effective political and defensive measures aimed at preventing the aggressor from unleashing a war and at depriving it of an illusory hope to win a victory in it.

It should be emphasized that it is for the first time that provisions concerning the prevention of war have been included in our military doctrine in such a direct way. Of course, previously, too, the military activity of the Soviet Union envisioned a struggle against war. But now that war is tantamount to suicide, to a global catastrophe, the task of struggling against war has been put to the fore in our doctrine.

Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, has repeatedly said that the old notions about war as a means to attain political ends became obsolete. He pointed out that in the nuclear age the outdated dogmas nourish a policy which may lead to an all-out conflagration.

Dwelling on the structure of the Soviet military doctrine, General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov showed the defensive character of its political and military-technical aspects. The political aspect reflects the attitude of the

Soviet state of war, the military and political tasks to prevent it, to strengthen the country's defenses and security. The military-technical aspect is subjugated to the political one and comprises the working out of military, organizational, technical, strategic and military-economic measures to prevent war and repulse a possible aggression.

The most important specific feature of the present Soviet military doctrine, just as of doctrines of other Warsaw Treaty member countries, is its strictly defensive nature. It is manifested above all in the defensive essence of the military-political tasks posed by the Soviet state, in all the practical affairs of the country—internal and foreign policy ones, in the nature and contents of military planning and military development, in the demands put to the development of the art of war.

Then the USSR defense minister touched upon the key provisions of the military doctrine which most patently show its defensive nature, pointed to the Soviet program aimed at completely eliminating nuclear weapons and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction before the end of this century, to reduce to the minimum conventional arms, limit the military potentials of the sides to the levels of sufficiency, ensuring the solution of defensive tasks only. We are in favor of deciding all disputes arising between states or alliances of states by a political way only, at peaceful negotiations, without the use of force or reliance on force, he said. Such an approach is indispensable in the nuclear space age, when the globe has become too fragile for power politics. Proceeding from this, the Soviet military doctrine envisions a broad range of measures aimed at the prevention of war, at the ensurance of security not only for its own country but also for allies.

The existing military-strategic parity is, as is known, an important factor of the prevention of war in present conditions. Its most patent indicator is the balance of strategic nuclear forces of the USSR and the United States, which was verified more than once and confirmed during the drafting of the SALT II Treaty and during the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms and the summit meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington.

The recognition of this balance by both sides and of the need to lower its level plays a positive role, attests to the possibility of arriving at mutual understanding and taking joint actions toward the solution of the most acute problems of the present, given goodwill. The evidence of this is the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The very fact of its conclusion says that prospects for creating a nuclear-free, non-violent world are materializing.

The Soviet defense minister named specific practical measures advanced by the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty countries directed at averting war.

While recognizing the existing military-strategic parity as a decisive factor to preventing war, the Soviet Union believes that the continued growth of its level will not result in greater security.

That is why our state jointly with other Warsaw Treaty member countries propose substantially cutting the armed forces and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The Warsaw Treaty member states are ready for consultations with the NATO countries on exchanging information about the numerical strength and armaments of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO in Europe and for consultations on this basis with the NATO countries with a view to finding ways for eliminating the existing imbalances and asymmetries."

Pointing to the need for transition from individual measures to a policy of trust, the speaker enumerated specific initiatives in this direction advanced by the Warsaw Treaty member countries.

The Soviet Union, in full agreement with other Warsaw Treaty member countries, he said, regards as abnormal the remaining division of Europe into opposing military blocs.

We favor the simultaneous disbanding of the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw Treaty and, as a first step, the elimination of their military organizations and establishment in the long run of a comprehensive system of international security."

Revealing the content of the principle of sufficiency for defense, Gen Yazov stressed the need for reciprocal actions by the sides to diminish military confrontation. He noted the importance of comparing the military

doctrines of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, of the USSR and the United States. This would help achieve mutual understanding regarding the need for sticking to defensive strategy.

The practical road toward implementing the concept of defensive strategy and the principle of sufficiency lies through mutual—with the United States and other NATO countries—restraint in the military field, through talks and agreements, coordinated actions, through maintaining equilibrium at lower levels without damaging anyone's security.

The vital issues of war and peace can and should be resolved, no matter how difficult they are, if all states realize their historic responsibility for the survival of mankind and look in the spirit of goodwill for measures to safeguard their and international security along lines of cooperation, rather than confrontation."

The Soviet defense minister replied to diplomats' questions.

**KGB's Major General Shadrin Dies 'Suddenly'**  
*PM020859 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian*  
*30 Apr 88 Second Edition p 6*

[Obituary of Major General V.P. Shadrin, signed by a "group of comrades"]

[Excerpts] Major General Vasilii Pavlovich Shadrin, a senior staffer in the USSR state security organs and a CPSU member since 1960, has died suddenly.

V.P. Shadrin was born in 1934 in the village of Ponomarevo in Kostroma Oblast's Oktyabrskiy Rayon. After graduating from Moscow State University, he worked in prosecutor's office organs. From 1967 he was involved in party work and was elected secretary and then second secretary of Yaroslavl CPSU Oblast's Rostovskiy Gorkom. From 1970 and until the last days of his life he was involved in operational and leadership work in the central apparatus of the KGB. [passage omitted].

A group of comrades.